

**ORAL**

**NO. 1 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ALLOCATION PROCEDURES**

Can Government state if they are now in a position to make an announcement of the major reforms to the Housing Allocation procedures that they referred to in answer to Question No. 2055 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Not yet.

**NO. 2 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how many Government tenants are currently listed as requiring work to be done in their homes by the Housing Department as landlords?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The total number of Government tenants currently listed as requiring response maintenance work to be done in their homes is 1,722.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister tell me if in that figure of 1,722 the Department makes any distinction between pensioners and elderly people who need work done to them?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Reports emanating from pensioners requesting response maintenance type of work are normally prioritised but also it would all depend as well whether they are an emergency, urgent, very urgent, routine, but normally they tend to get prioritised and that is taken into account by the Reporting Office.



**ORAL**

**NO. 3 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many applicants on the Housing Waiting List to date are medically recommended giving the breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 4 of 2005.

**NO. 4 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PERSONS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many persons to date are medically recommended, excluding those that are described as applicants on the Housing Waiting List, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

There are 43 housing applicants who are medically recommended. The breakdown is as follows:

Medical 'A'	-	15
Medical 'B'	-	12
Medical 'C'	-	16

There are also 217 persons medically recommended excluding those who are also applicants. The breakdown is as follows:

Medical 'A'	-	83
Medical 'B'	-	56
Medical 'C'	-	78

**ORAL**

**NO. 5 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated to date since the end of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of eight pre-war housing units have been allocated to date since the end of November 2004.

ORAL

NO. 6 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the pre-list for housing to date giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Answered together with Question No. 7 of 2005.

**NO. 7 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the Housing Waiting List to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

There are 502 applicants on the pre-list. The breakdown is as follows:

1RKB	-	303
2RKB	-	43
3RKB	-	102
4RKB	-	49
5RKB	-	4
6RKB	-	1

In addition to that there are 650 applicants on the waiting list. The breakdown is as follows:

1RKB	-	376
2RKB	-	48
3RKB	-	146
4RKB	-	68
5RKB	-	10
6RKB	-	2

**ORAL**

**NO. 8 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF REPOSSESSED FLATS**

Can Government state how many Government flats were repossessed in the financial year 2004/2005 giving a breakdown of pre-war and post-war?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of 15 flats were repossessed and the breakdown is as follows:

Pre-war	-	5
Post-war	-	10

**ORAL**

**NO. 9 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on full rent relief for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 10 to 13 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 10 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that had the level of rent relief reduced for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 9 and 11 to 13 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 11 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on rent relief that had this benefit terminated during the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 9, 10 and 12 to 13 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 12 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that received rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 9 to 11 and 13 of 2005.

**NO. 13 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that applied for rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005 and how many of these were approved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 9**

A total of 185 households were on full rent relief for the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 10**

A total of 365 households had their level of rent relief reduced for the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 11**

A total of 149 households had their rent relief benefit terminated in the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 12**

A total of 802 households received rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 13**

The total number of households that applied for rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005 was 77 of which 66 were approved.

**ORAL**

**NO. 14 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government state how many tenants entered into agreements to pay arrears of rent during the financial year 2004/2005 and what was the total of arrears covered by such arrangements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of 167 tenants entered into an agreement of rent arrears in the financial year 2004/2005. The total amount of arrears covered by such agreement is £804,607.65.

ORAL

**NO. 15 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 9A CRUTCHETT’S RAMP**

Can Government state if they are aware of the dilapidated state of the landings and main stairways of the Government housing units known as “9A Crutchett’s Ramp”?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Yes, Government are aware.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 15 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is there any plan that Government have to remedy this?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Temporary measures were introduced and the situation is being monitored. This is already included in the wider plan maintenance strategy being implemented by Government.

**ORAL**

**NO. 16 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state what is the composition of the Housing Advisory Council established in October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 17 of 2005.

**NO. 17 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state how many times the Housing Advisory Council has met since its first meeting in October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 16**

The composition of the Housing Advisory Council is as follows:

- The Minister for Housing who is the Chairman;
- The Minister for the Environment, Roads and Utilities;
- The Principal Housing Officer;
- The Chief Technical Officer of the Technical Services Department;
- The Chief Executive of Buildings & Works; and representatives from the Association of Private Landlords, Association of Private Estates, Government Housing Tenants Associations, Action for Housing and the Gibraltar Bankers Association.

**Answer to Question No. 17**

The Housing Advisory Council has met on two occasions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 16 AND 17 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister tell me if one of the purposes of this Council is to advise, to monitor and maybe to look at pricing in the housing market in Gibraltar?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes I can confirm that.



ORAL

NO. 18 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUILDINGS & WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state what progress has been made in the discussions taking place with the Unions regarding the movement of the workforce of Buildings & Works Department into a proposed authority?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Discussions are on-going.

**ORAL**

**NO. 19 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving Social Assistance in respect of each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 have been employed since and how many are still receiving Social Assistance giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 20 to 22 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 20 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2005 have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 19 and 21 to 22 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 21 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving Social Assistance for each month of the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2004 giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 19 to 20 and 22 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 22 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving Social Assistance for each month of the first quarter of 2005 giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 22/2005**

Answer to Question No. 19

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER OF 2004**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 4 2004	Oct-04	199	286	485	82	153	114	136
	Nov-04	197	290	487	81	152	116	138
	Dec-04	197	292	489	88	150	114	137

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE FOURTH QUARTER 2004**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 4 2004	Oct-04	4	2	6	2	1	2	1
	Nov-04	11	3	14	2	4	7	1
	Dec-04	3	2	5	1	3	1	0

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 20TH APRIL 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
20-Apr-05	184	292	476	70	151	119	136

....contd...

**Contd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 22 OF 2005**

Answer to Question No. 20

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FIRST QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 1 2005	Jan-05	200	294	494	86	152	116	140
	Feb-05	189	294	483	77	153	116	137
	Mar-05	194	291	485	80	149	120	136

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE FIRST QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 1 2005	Jan-05	4	0	4	0	1	2	1
	Feb-05	8	0	8	3	3	1	1
	Mar-05	5	3	8	3	2	2	1

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 20TH APRIL 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
20-Apr-05	184	292	476	70	151	119	136

...contd....

**Contd..ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 22/2005**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 21 AND 22 OF 2005**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE 4TH QUARTER OF 2004 AND 1ST QUARTER OF 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE.**

2004	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
OCTOBER	199	286	485	82	153	114	136
NOVEMBER	197	290	487	81	152	116	138
DECEMBER	197	292	489	88	150	114	137

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
JANUARY	200	294	494	86	152	116	140
FEBRUARY	189	294	483	77	153	116	137
MARCH	194	291	485	80	149	120	136



**ORAL**

**NO. 23 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a Disability Allowance under the Social Assistance arrangements for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 24 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 24 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a Disability Allowance under the Social Assistance arrangements for each month of the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2005 giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 24/2005**

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 23 and 24

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE 4TH QUARTER OF 2004 AND 1ST QUARTER OF 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

Months	0-10	1 1-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Total	Male	Female
Oct-04	26	28	21	13	16	10	0	114	81	33
Nov-04	27	28	21	13	16	10	0	115	81	34
Dec-04	26	29	21	12	17	10	0	115	81	34

Months	0-10	1 1-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Total	Male	Female
Jan-05	25	30	21	12	17	10	0	115	81	34
Feb-05	25	29	22	11	18	10	0	115	81	34
Mar-05	25	29	22	11	18	10	0	115	81	34

ORAL

**NO. 25 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund, giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 26 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 26 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the first quarter of 2005 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners, showing the number of Gibraltar/UK nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 25 and 27 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 27 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 25, 26 and 28 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 28 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the first quarter of 2005 showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 25 to 27 and 29 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 29 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 25 to 28 and 30 of 2005.



**NO. 30 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the first quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question Nos. 25 to 28**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested in Question Nos. 25 to 28.

**Answer to Question Nos. 29 and 30**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2004 and 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2005 are as follows:

October 2004	-	£900,000
November 2004	-	£850,000
December 2004	-	£1,350,000
January 2005	-	£600,000
February 2005	-	£850,000
March 2005	-	£900,000

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 30/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 25/ 2005**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from Oct 2004 – Dec 2004.

	<b>OCT-04</b>	<b>NOV- 04</b>	<b>DEC- 04</b>
<b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>	6431	6415	6385
<b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b>	4912	4936	4941
<b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>	1511	1510	1512
<b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>	431	434	437
<b>Total</b>	<b>13285</b>	<b>13295</b>	<b>13275</b>

...Contd....

**Contd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO.30/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 26/ 2005**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from Jan 2005 – Mar 2005.

	<b>JAN-05</b>	<b>FEB- 05</b>	<b>MAR- 05</b>
<b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>	6371	6336	6299
<b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b>	4941	4959	4961
<b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>	1569	1607	1626
<b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>	443	449	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>13324</b>	<b>13351</b>	<b>13330</b>

.....Contd.....

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 30**

Answer to Question Nos. 27 and 28

The income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds is as follows:

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<b><u>31-Oct-04</u></b>	<b><u>30-Nov-04</u></b>	<b><u>31-Dec-04</u></b>	<b><u>31-Jan-05</u></b>	<b><u>28-Feb-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Mar-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£866,646	£589,677	£526,132	£871,654	£559,427	£550,651
<b><u>"Local Account"</u></b>						
Opening Balance	£72,107	£85,987	£67,911	£229,374	£73,831	£39,927
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Transfers from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund	£900,000	£850,000	£1,350,000	£600,000	£850,000	£900,000
Other Receipts	£2,566	£2,091	£588	£1,343	£1,791	£3,989
	£974,673	£938,078	£1,418,499	£830,717	£925,622	£943,916
<b><u>Less</u></b>						
Pension Payments	(£888,686)	(£870,167)	(£1,189,125)	(£756,886)	(£885,695)	(£928,768)
Closing Balance	£85,987	£67,911	£229,374	£73,831	£39,927	£15,148
<b><u>"Spanish Account"</u></b>						
Opening Balance	£794,539	£503,690	£458,221	£642,280	£485,596	£510,724
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts from DFID	£40,000	£90,000	£1,480,000	£20,000	£170,000	£1,010,000
	£834,539	£593,690	£1,938,221	£662,280	£655,596	£1,520,724
<b><u>Less</u></b>						
Pension Payments	(£330,849)	(£135,469)	(£1,295,941)	(£176,684)	(£144,872)	(£1,060,870)
Closing Balance	£503,690	£458,221	£642,280	£485,596	£510,724	£459,854
<b><u>Fund Account</u></b>						
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	£589,677	£526,132	£871,654	£559,427	£550,651	£475,002

ORAL

**NO. 31 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the fourth quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 32 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 32 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement with the information requested.

### **ANSWER TO QUESTION 32**

Answer to Question 31 and 32

The income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005 is as follows:

#### **SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

	<u>31-Oct-04</u>	<u>30-Nov-04</u>	<u>31-Dec-04</u>	<u>31-Jan-05</u>	<u>28-Feb-05</u>	<u>31-Mar-05</u>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£6,005,597	£5,970,078	£5,957,947	£5,933,080	£5,960,064	£5,962,202
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	£46,315	£46,284	£43,558	£90,439	£84,179	£194,684
	<u>£6,051,912</u>	<u>£6,016,362</u>	<u>£6,001,505</u>	<u>£6,023,519</u>	<u>£6,044,243</u>	<u>£6,156,886</u>
<b><u>Less</u></b>						
Payments	(£81,834)	(£58,415)	(£68,425)	(£63,455)	(£82,041)	(£82,150)
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£5,970,078</u>	<u>£5,957,947</u>	<u>£5,933,080</u>	<u>£5,960,064</u>	<u>£5,962,202</u>	<u>£6,074,736</u>

ORAL

**NO. 33 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the fourth quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 34 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 34 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement with the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 34**

Answer to Q. Nos. 33 and 34

The income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005 is as follows:

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<u>31-Oct-04</u>	<u>30-Nov-05</u>	<u>31-Dec-04</u>	<u>31-Jan-05</u>	<u>28-Feb-05</u>	<u>31-Mar-05</u>
<b>Fund Account -</b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£10,069,197	£9,901,120	£9,858,821	£9,142,890	£9,432,885	£9,369,493
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	£832,656	£883,371	£738,792	£971,037	£869,039	£902,924
	£10,901,853	£10,784,491	£10,597,613	£10,113,927	£10,301,924	£10,272,418
Payments	(£1,000,733)	(£925,670)	(£1,454,723)	(£681,042)	(£932,431)	(£989,457)
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	£9,901,120	£9,858,821	£9,142,890	£9,432,885	£9,369,493	£9,282,961

**NO. 35 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OLD AGE PENSION**

Can Government state when they intend to introduce a scheme whereby divorced women will be entitled to the full benefits of their future old age pension based on their ex-husband's contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The Government have a manifesto commitment to introduce a scheme to rectify the fact that at present when a woman is divorced she loses all the benefit of future old age pension entitlement based on her ex-husband's contribution. I cannot yet tell the hon Member when the Government will implement this particular commitment. It is possible that it will be during this year.

ORAL

**NO. 36 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – REDUCED RATE**

Can Government state whether their policy to introduce the opportunity for married women who have paid the reduced rate of Social Insurance contributions to make retrospective payments of the difference to the level of a full contribution will apply to women aged 60 and over?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The details of this policy have not yet been worked out and therefore I cannot address questions relating to what those details will be.

**NO. 37 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government confirm that all pensioners not living with relatives are legally entitled to the Minimum Income Guarantee irrespective of nationality and whether they have paid Social Insurance contributions or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The Minimum Income Guarantee is not the subject of any legal entitlement nor is it linked to status of pensioner but to age.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 37 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Yes, but does it apply to different nationalities of people living in Gibraltar?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

When the scheme was devised the categories eligible were any person who is residing in Gibraltar who has either a certificate of permanent residence or indefinite residence, or any person who holds a residence permit which at the date of issue was valid for a period in excess of one year.

**NO. 38 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state where the four emergency exits in Mount Alvernia are situated within the building and are Government satisfied that they are clearly sign posted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The four fire escape exits are situated as follows. The north staircase which exits to the rear alley at the back of the building on the ground floor, the central staircase which exits to the west, that is Engineers Road, at the front of the building on the ground floor, the annex staircase which exits to the east of the building at the back entrance to Mount Alvernia on the third floor, and the south staircase which exits to the alley at the rear of the building at the ground floor. Government are satisfied that the ECA has ensured that the recommendations of the Supervising Health and Safety Officer and the Fire Prevention Department have been complied with.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 38 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

That may be so but I can assure the hon Lady that the emergency exits are not clearly signposted and I would suggest that she looks into the matter.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, the ECA can only follow the recommendations of the professionals. Neither the ECA Manager or myself, or himself with all due respect, is qualified to decide where, how and when signposting should be placed.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

That may be as it may but I have had suggestions from relatives of residents in Mount Alvernia that these are not clearly signposted and again, as the hon Lady has stated, we are not experts in these matters but if I could suggest it to her it might be worth her while to have a look, please.

**ORAL**

**NO. 39 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**POST OF SOCIAL WORKER**

Can Government state how many applications have been received for the post of Social Worker after the vacancy was advertised earlier this year by the closing date of 5<sup>th</sup> April 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

There have been nine applicants.

ORAL

**NO. 40 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of Social Insurance schedules as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01, giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 41 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 41 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of Social Insurance schedules as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01 giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed, of persons entering insured employment in each such quarter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 40**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested in Question No. 40.

**Answer to Question No. 41**

As I stated in answer to a similar question asked previously, the DSS computer system cannot provide the information requested in Question No. 41.

# **ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 41/2005**

Answer to Question No 40 of 2005

## **Social Insurance Returns for 2001 as at 31 March 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed		
	Number of Employers all	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns
Qtr.1/01	1248	14678	706	397	1068	9889	588	280	4243	87	29	546
Qtr.2/01	1257	15058	809	401	1075	10215	688	282	4293	84	30	550
Qtr.3/01	1269	15191	1042	400	1076	10378	869	278	4267	119	33	546
Qtr.4/01	1278	14986	1990	619	1072	10134	1860	457	4282	90	35	570
										40		
										89		
										89		
										127		

### **Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2001.

...cont...

# Contd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 41/2005

Answer to Question No 40 of 2005

## Social Insurance Returns for 2002 as at 31 March 2005

Qtr.1/02	All			Private			Official			Self Employed		
	Number of Employers all	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns
Qtr.1/02	1301	15433	908	646	1076	10527	822	473	4363	51	46	543
Qtr.2/02	1319	15522	1013	630	1078	10610	879	457	4366	92	46	546
Qtr.3/02	1333	15664	1201	628	1086	10742	1033	455	4365	120	46	557
Qtr.4/02	1342	15456	1255	662	1079	10466	1088	488	4437	100	47	553

### Note:-

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002.

...cont...

**Answer to Question No 40 of 2005**

**Social Insurance Returns for 2003 as at 31 March 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers <i>all</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers <i>returned</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending			
Qtr.1/03	1370	15552	1005	1156	1069	10518	916	846	4523	55	97	511	34	213
Qtr.2/03	1395	15895	1267	1136	1071	10763	1145	826	4619	82	97	513	40	213
Qtr.3/03	1409	15487	2160	1128	1051	10310	2016	820	4662	95	95	515	49	213
Qtr.4/03	1422	15341	2075	1134	1054	10180	1922	828	4661	86	95	500	67	211

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2003.

54



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 40 TO 41 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not the computer system, I take it it is the programme that is not able to extract the information and therefore has any attempt been made to see whether it is possible to do it since the last question?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

It is a question of modifying the programme as opposed to the system. I did ask the Department in the last House when the same question was raised, I asked them to look at it. Obviously I was prompted of the same matter when I read the question this time round, I asked again and apparently they have not considered it.

ORAL

**NO. 42 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of January to March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 42 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of January to March 2005 is as follows:

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

	<b><u>31-Jan-05</u></b>	<b><u>28-Feb-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Mar-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>			
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£5,083,894	£5,046,606	£4,985,936
<b><u>Add</u></b>			
Receipts	£27,070	£21,653	£43,274
	<u>£5,110,964</u>	<u>£5,068,259</u>	<u>£5,029,210</u>
<b><u>Less</u></b>			
Payments	<u>(£64,358)</u>	<u>(£82,323)</u>	<u>(£63,001)</u>
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£5,046,606</u>	<u>£4,985,936</u>	<u>£4,966,209</u>



**ORAL**

**NO. 43 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government confirm whether the excavation works at the Theatre Royal site have caused any damage to adjacent buildings?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 44, 45 and 46 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 44 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether there have been any problems with the structure of the walls left at the site of the Old Theatre Royal?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

Answered together with Question Nos. 43 and 45 to 46 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 45 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state what were the subject matters of the full range of reports mentioned in answer to Questions 953-958/2004 in relation to the Theatre Royal giving a breakdown by report and the purpose of each report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 43, 44 and 46 of 2005.

**NO. 46 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Are Government in a position to publish the two reports that were commissioned to Theatre Projects Consultants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The excavation works have not caused any damage to adjacent buildings, neither have there been any problems with the structure of the walls left at the site. There have only ever been two reports commissioned by Government on the Theatre Royal as follows. First the February 1998 M E Belilo and Partners and others report, which was a building survey report for the rehabilitation and refurbishment of the Theatre Royal. The second one was the September 1999 Theatre Projects Consultants Report, which was one on the practicalities of re-opening the Theatre Royal. Government do not consider there is a need to publish the reports.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 43 TO 46 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have asked these questions specifically because in answer to questions as mentioned in Questions No. 953 to 958 of 2004, when I asked this question in the previous House the Minister actually stated that there were only two reports, I can confirm that, and he stated exactly that they were M Belilo and Partners and Theatre Projects Consultants, but in supplementaries after that the Chief Minister intervened and he said that there were a full range of reports that were commissioned. Therefore this is why I have posed these questions. Why did the Chief Minister then say that there were a full range of reports? One would assume that the word 'full' means more than two and 'range', 'full range' means more than two that is why I have posed the question. I would also like to add another supplementary which is that the Minister has stated that there is not any problem with adjacent buildings and I would like to ask, which he has not answered, if there is any problems and why they have contractors in now, or do they have contractors in now in order to fix some of the walls or at least make them safe?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

On the second supplementary I have to say that the site is regularly inspected by structural engineers and in fact the walls are firmer than they have ever been. There was piling work done there a year and a half ago and they are in a perfectly safe condition. As I say, there are regular inspections carried out by structural engineers so the Government are content in that respect. As to the first part of the supplementary, if the hon Member looks at Hansard I think the Chief Minister himself subsequent to having said that there were and in reference to ARUP the engineers part of the team, in reference to ARUP's work the Chief Minister did say there was a full range of reports and then he went on to qualify that there is a difference between the reports and indeed there is a difference between the two reports that I have mentioned, which were commissioned by Government, and the on-going exchange of information of the design team which is something that is very normal and part of the RIBA stages of design. In other words, at each stage of design there is an exchange of information within the design team, which of course Government are privy to, in all sorts of things and I think the Chief Minister explained during those questions and supplementaries to Question Nos. 953 to 958 of 2004 and exchange of information in respect of services such as architectural matters, structural matters, sound and acoustics elements, quantity surveying elements, that sort of information. That is what the Chief Minister was making reference to and not to further reports commissioned by the Government in respect of the structure of the building and so on. Government are content that the structure is perfectly safe and that is the position as it stands now.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just one last point, does the Minister have any indication as to when or if the project is going to get off the ground?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Certainly the Theatre Royal project very much continues to have its place on the list of Government projects but I think the Chief Minister has reminded me that he has in fact announced that this will take its place after the leisure centre and the housing is carried out.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So much for the vision thing, but the one issue that the Minister has studiously avoided replying to, is this question of the surrounding buildings that the Hon Mr Linares has asked about. In fact, it is obvious to anybody who cares to walk around the area that a lot of the surrounding buildings are being pinned by a Government contractor in the fashion that buildings are pinned when their foundations have been disturbed by building works around them. Now can the Minister specifically address that point and can he specifically confirm that no structure adjacent to the Theatre Royal has been affected by those works?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think it is the same question disguised in rather different, more colourful language but the answer is the same.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, the answer cannot be the same because the answer provided to date has not addressed the issue of adjoining buildings or buildings surrounding the Theatre Royal. The Minister has given an answer as to the structure of the building itself but he has studiously avoided answering the question that was put about the structures of buildings around the Theatre Royal. Again, anybody who cares to walk around the area will see that the buildings that face onto I think Cannon Lane, which are those old colonial homes that are there, I think one of them is in the ownership of the Catholic Church and the others are in private ownership, are being pinned on the Theatre Royal side by JBS. It is obvious, it is visible, why would they be pinned by the Government's own contractor if their structures are not somehow affected or potentially affected by the massive crater that has been left by this project?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether the hon Member has the problem suffered by some people I know that their brains do not crank up until a certain time of the morning and until they have had a certain minimum number of cups of coffee, but I do not know on what basis he says that this issue of damage to adjacent buildings is a supplementary and that the answer that the Minister gave has studiously avoided addressing that issue. He clearly leaps to his feet without any background information and without even having listened to what has been uttered in his earshot in the last 60 seconds before he rises to his feet. One of the questions asked was, 'can Government confirm whether the excavation works of the Theatre Royal have caused any damage to adjacent buildings?', to which the very first part of the Minister's answer was, 'the excavation works have not caused any damage to adjacent buildings'. So he has had the Government's answer and that is it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister might need a caffeine injection himself. These buildings, as I am trying to explain to him, are not necessarily adjacent. They do not necessarily touch the Theatre Royal, they are on the other side of the crater. Now, if the answer is simply that even those buildings on the other side of the crater, not adjacent like all the others that are on the eastern side of the Theatre Royal, are also not affected then so be it but can we just have an answer to that question, because those buildings and it may be that the Chief Minister does not deign to walk around that area given the state in which it has been left in by his Government, those buildings are being pinned by JBS. So what is the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is that the word 'adjacent' has a clear meaning in the English language, if he does not know what it means there is a very useful publication called 'The Concise Oxford Dictionary' which he is free to refer to at any time, and he cannot

alter the meaning of the word to suit his political convenience on a particular Friday morning in Parliamentary debate in Gibraltar. That is the answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Let us be more precise then. The buildings that face onto Cannon Lane that back onto the area of the crater left by the Theatre Royal are being pinned by Government, whether adjacent in his definition or adjacent in my definition, are they being pinned as a result of the works carried out by the Government which has left that crater where the Theatre Royal used to be? Yes or No? Very simple, even the Chief Minister without his first cup of coffee should be able to answer that one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Those buildings by any definition are adjacent and therefore covered by the answer that the Minister gave.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Are Government spending any extra money in relation to the Theatre Royal since my last question in this House, where I asked how much was spent?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

All building sites require a certain degree of monitoring, routine monitoring, routine supervision to render them safe. Every building site. The crater, as they like to call it, in the Theatre Royal building site, any building site in Gibraltar, any building site anywhere in the world has and places the public authorities in a particular need, where it is a public site, to monitor and to carry out works to make sure that the building site is kept safe. That has its costs. Of course there is a cost, it is not a huge cost but it costs more than a site which is not a building site to inspect, to monitor and to keep safe, that is absolutely correct and hon Members can rest assured that the vision is but delayed. The vision stands Gibraltar will get its Theatre Royal but I think it will get its housing and its leisure centre first.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Have the Government, although the Chief Minister and the Minister have said that there is no damage to adjacent buildings, are the Government spending any money on adjacent buildings just to keep it safe?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think that the Chief Minister has just answered that question. It is the same question again in a different form. I mean, there are on-going works in the building site and that is what is happening there, that is all.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government confirm that JBS is now working on an adjacent building in order to secure its safety?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

JBS carries out work from time to time pursuant to the answer I have just given the hon Member a few seconds ago, in order to ensure the continuation of the safety of the site, not in order to bring about its safety. The site is already safe.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state how much is going to be the cost of keeping JBS inspecting its safety?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it depends on what works they do from time to time but remember that JBS is a Government-owned company, they use their own labour which is already paid for whether they inspect the Theatre Royal or not. There is therefore not any real cost unless and until they actually carry out work which involves labour and which involves materials and the redeployment of labour from other sites. Then the cost is the delay to the other works that they could be doing if that labour was not otherwise engaged.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But is not the work that they do there charged to a particular Head of Expenditure then in the Government Estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it may be but then there is revenue of a Government-owned company.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, my question is, is the work that they do there actually billed by the company to the Government and paid for and charged to a Government Head of Expenditure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes but then it is the revenue of a Government-owned company.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well yes, of course, I know that so is everything else that they do and so is what they do in Industrial Cleaners, and so is what they do in Community Projects, what has that got to do with it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer that I have given him. I may not have chosen the words that he wanted me to choose but that is exactly the answer. Yes, but it is then in turn the revenue of a Government-owned company.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but then in turn it is the revenue of the workers that work for them and then they pay tax which in turn is the revenue of the Government. We know all that, that is how the whole of the economy works.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So why did the hon Member ask the question?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The question that I want to ask is whether they are actually charging the Government for the costs they do so that we can identify where it is being paid from, that is all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer was contained in the first word of my answer which is 'yes', and then I have added 'but then it is the revenue of a Government-owned company'. He appears to take umbrage at the fact that I add things to the answer that he wants to hear.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well no, the implication seems to be that somehow it does not matter because it is paid to a Government-owned company and it would matter if it was paid to a different company. Well look, of course it is revenue of a Government-owned company, what has that got to do with it? That has got nothing to do with the answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot believe I am hearing what the hon Member is saying, that cannot be the extent of his powers of economic analysis. If the cost of referring these works were flowing out of the wide umbrella of public funds, which includes funds in the Government and funds in publicly-owned companies, and it was being paid to an outside contractor, that would be a loss of funds from the public out into the private

sector. If on the other hand labour that is already being paid for out of public funds is used to deliver a service somewhere on the public estate, and the Government for the sake of accounting propriety causes a charge to be raised to the appropriate Government account, the money then flows from one Government pocket into the other Government pocket and stays in the general and wide umbrella of public funds, because the labour that the hon Member is saying then gets paid, was going to be paid anyway. JBS does not hire and dismiss people depending on whether it has Theatre Royals to inspect or does not have Theatre Royals to inspect. Therefore the cost of those inspections are already being borne by a Government-owned company. So when a revenue is generated, well an expense to the Government and a revenue to the company, is generated for that service it is just moving from one to the other and it is staying under Government control. It is not being used to pay the wages, those wages were being paid anyway.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I have to say this is a new approach on the part of the Government. In my knowledge the only Government company that has been treated as if it was an extension of the public service is Community Projects, where the work that they do is not identified and when we have asked questions in this House we have been told they get given £2 million to meet their labour costs and it does not really matter how they spend it because there is no billing and no invoicing. But JBS is required to tender for projects on occasions against private contractors, why does the Chief Minister not apply the logic of the answer he has just given me and in order to keep it within the ambit of public spending as he has described today, give priority of all the work to JBS and only goes out to contract when JBS is incapable of doing the work?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the Leader of the Opposition has just said has got absolutely nothing to do with the subject that we are discussing and it is just an attempt to divert the issue. JBS does not tender for internal Government work. JBS does not tender to do works in the Education Department, JBS does not tender to do the vast majority of work. JBS tenders, when it wants to, when there are projects to be done which the Government have put out to tender and it tenders for relatively few of them, and often the Government requires the tender to be done in order to make sure that JBS is doing the work for a market tested value for money basis. As, for example, happens in some of the hon Member's housing schemes but I do not see what this has got to do with the fact that a charge by JBS to the Government when JBS does a labour service for the Government, is not money that flows out of the definition of publicly-controlled funds because JBS is a Government-owned company. In contrast to what would be the case if the contractor were a fully private sector company which would then be an outflow of cash from the Government. That is the issue we were debating, nothing about whether JBS should or should always get the work without tender, and nothing to do with the comparison between JBS and Community Projects.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the Chief Minister started his answer by saying he does not know what this has to do. The only thing it has to do is that he has chosen to create this debate about the mechanics of payments to JBS when my simple question originally was simply 'is

there going to be a sum of money billed somewhere which we can identify?' That is all I was asking.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes but then it becomes the revenue of a Government-owned company.

-----

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I raise an issue in relation to Question No. 43 of 2005, which has been raised with me as a result of somebody listening to our debate this morning. Question No. 43 of 2005 deals with the Theatre and the buildings adjoining or opposite it et cetera. I have been contacted by a member of the public who heard the debate, he tells me that his property is now being pinned as a result of his being told that it has become unsafe because of the works carried out at the Theatre Royal. The company doing the pinning is JBS and the safety issue relates to the wall of the property, sliding in layman's terms, I do not know what it is I suppose displacement of the wall into what I called this morning figuratively the crater that has been left by the Theatre Royal. There was a lot of exchange about that this morning and I wonder whether the Chief Minister or the Minister for Culture, I say Chief Minister because they were both involved in the debate, could comment on that given that what they were saying this morning where they were giving the impression that there was no such problem with any property.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know of no procedure in this House which entitles the hon Member, if the hon Member wants to put down a substantive motion in relation to the subject of the safety of premises adjoining, he is perfectly free to do so but I know of no procedure that entitles him to come back to this House and to say 'I have been told in the street this or that, does the hon Member want to comment on it?'. I am sorry. I am not willing to comment.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, we have often come back to questions in this House after debate, so if I simply have to say to him, change my request for comment and simply say to him: 'do the Government not agree that that suggests that the information that they provided to this House this morning was either erroneous or misleading?'

**MR SPEAKER:**

I allow the hon Member to invite the Chief Minister or the Minister for Culture to comment on something that he has been appraised of during the course of the day, the Chief Minister has declined to comment and that must be the end of the matter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

He has declined to comment on the basis I have asked him to comment, but he has not necessarily said that he is not going to answer a question and that is why I would ask Mr Speaker to allow them to answer the question. They may take the view that they want to rely on Mr Speaker's ruling in order not to answer the question. Perhaps so would I if I were them, having told this House this morning that there is absolutely no problem to now be faced with this problem.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is not going to re-engage in debate on that issue on the basis of hearsay that he brings to this House. The Government stand by the answers they have given in this House this morning and there is no procedure which entitles him to properly re-open that debate now. He is free, if he is not satisfied with the accuracy of the information that the Government have given to him, to put down a substantive motion on this issue if he wants to. I am quite happy to debate it with him in the proper place, at the proper time and under the proper procedure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will take the answer that the Government stand by their answer this morning as the answer.

**NO. 47 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CULTURE – SPRING FESTIVAL**

Can Government state how many events in this years Spring Festival have actually been organised by the Ministry of Culture?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Ministry for Culture is involved in the organisation of the Spring Festival in its entirety.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 47 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that mean, for example, that they organise the plays, they direct the play, the Ministry of Culture actually acts the play? This is the point I am trying to make. It is a question of are the events organised, not the actual whole Spring Festival, but each individual event?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Minister for Culture does not direct plays even though he has been known to take part in plays in the past.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

A pantomime.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well, I could answer that but I choose not to Mr Picardo. It is not a pantomime no, it is a very serious matter actually and people involved in culture take it very seriously, both in the Ministry and those who participate.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No I mean this pantomime.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well not on this side of the House Mr Picardo. The involvement of the Ministry for Culture as organiser of the Spring Festival obviously varies. The extent of involvement varies. In some cases it will be providing a venue, in other cases we will actually be hands-on such as the Spring Art Festival for example. In others it will be financial support, as in the case of the Sea Scouts who hosted a pipe band from Asturias. So the degree of involvement varies with the event but the Spring Festival is organised in its entirety by the Ministry for Culture.

**NO. 48 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ARTS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state how many times the Arts Advisory Council has met in 2004 and 2005 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Once in 2004 and to date once this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 48 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Arts Advisory Council involved in organising the Spring Festival?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Arts Advisory Council advises the Ministry for Culture on all aspects of culture.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that include the Spring Festival?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Spring Festival is part of everything that happens in culture of course.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state that if they have only met once, it seems that that meeting must have been a very, very effective meeting to have organised all the things or advised the Government on all the things including the Spring Festival. Does the Minister not agree that the Arts Advisory Council in one meeting had such an effective meeting that they were able to organise the Spring Festival, does the Minister agree with that?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

They do not organise the Spring Festival, they advise Government on all aspects of culture.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister say how long the meeting lasted, a week? Or is it like the House where we adjourn and we carry on the same session?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

In those meetings I can confirm that we do not tend to get the kind of lengthy extensions to questions which are unnecessary and usually quite beside the point, hence those meetings of the Culture Advisory Council are very productive and not necessarily as lengthy.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Maybe these meetings are lengthy because of the extended answering to the question from the Chief Minister which diverts, and the Minister as well, divert from one topic to another like we did in the previous question. I would like to ask the Minister then, does the Minister envisage that they will be having another meeting in 2005?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Meetings are held as and when required.



ORAL

**NO. 49 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state what is the cost to the Youth Service to run the Youth Leaders Course every year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 50 and 51 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 50 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state how much it costs each student to enrol in the Youth Leaders Course?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 49 and 51 of 2005.

**NO. 51 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state how many people have enrolled in the Youth Leaders Course for the current year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Ten persons have enrolled in the Youth Leaders Course for the current year.

There are no fees charged to students of the Youth Service Youth Leader courses.

The Youth Leaders Courses run by the Youth Service have cost the following:-

2001/2002	-	£1,500 – tutor costs	
2002/2003	-	£1,500 – tutor costs	
2003/2004	-	£1,500 – tutor costs	
2004/2005	-	zero extra cost	- consequent on in-house staff now having acquired the necessary expertise and experience to conduct the courses and these being carried out during programmed Youth Worker sessions as part of their normal working week.

**NO. 52 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – YOUTH CLUBS**

Can Government confirm whether our Youth Clubs are opened every evening to cater for the needs of young people?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Our Youth Clubs are scheduled to open under the direct supervision of the Youth Service, on average on three weekdays every week.

However, clubs do open on other days during the week for specific events, either organised by the Youth Service or in response to specific requests from organisations dealing with young people. Other events, not necessarily club-based are of course also held on other days; including weekends, in order to cater for the needs of young people.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 52 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

What I would like to ask again is, are the clubs open in the evening, the Minister stated three days a week but not for events, just opened with a Youth Leader there in order for young people who might be roaming about or be bored, or just wanting to go somewhere without having something organised for them but to chat to somebody, for counselling? Can the Minister confirm whether these Youth Clubs are open for that purpose as well in the evening?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member seems to be out of touch somewhat with what the Youth Service work is like nowadays. I think the type of Youth Service that he is referring to used to work in the past. Nowadays they are much more structured in their approach and of course they are open in the evenings, as I said, at least three evenings, three days including the evenings under the direct supervision of the Youth Service, but then other evenings and other days of the week other things happen but the service is like that nowadays. It is not just a question of going in there if one feels like it, it tends to be much more structured. Of course, people walking in from the street are very welcome.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It is virtually impossible for people walking in the streets to go into a club that is closed. If it is three days a week and two of them it is shut, they cannot walk around and go into them, but can the Minister confirm whether this happens to all Youth Clubs or just a specific one or is it the Youth Club which is near the Youth Service Office?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, the days they open varies with the needs of their catchment area as it were.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would appreciate if the Minister would enlighten me as in to the new programmes and new ways that the Youth Service now works on another day, he does not need to do it today, I can have a chat with him about it because I am really interested. I think I am very, very up to date but he seems to be more up to date than myself.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is my job but I mean, he is very welcome to talk to the present Youth Leaders who will enlighten him, and I am very pleased to enlighten him as well.

ORAL

**NO. 53 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – MONIES STOLEN**

Can Government confirm whether the monies stolen from the Youth Service has been replaced by Government from the Youth Service budget or whether extra funds have been allocated to cover this shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 54 of 2005.

**NO. 54 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – MONIES STOLEN**

Can Government state what were the conclusions of the investigation into the Youth Service theft?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The matter is still with the Royal Gibraltar Police as regards the investigation.

As for the monies stolen from the Youth Service, which was extra income from fund raising from youth activities and not voted funds, these have nonetheless been replaced from savings identified in other sub-heads of the Youth and Sport vote.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 53 AND 54 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, I do know that it is not funds that were allocated for Youth. Can the Minister confirm whether these monies were the monies collected by the Youth or the young people at the fair, and therefore it was money which was to be allocated for charities that was stolen?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I can confirm that the monies stolen were indeed raised through various activities held in the Youth Pavilion at the fair by young people from a variety of organisations, dance groups, sports clubs. I cannot confirm whether all those funds were going to go to charity through these organisations or whether they were just simply fund raising for their own organisation but they were not voted funds, they were monies collected by these young people.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I know that the Minister has said that the Police are still investigating and probably it would be sensitive to talk about the investigation but can the Minister state whether there will be any time limit, because if the perpetrator of the theft is still at large and

will be at large and not caught, surely the investigation must come to a halt at one point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member well knows, the Government have no role whatsoever in relation to and certainly no control over the investigation by the Police of alleged possible offences. The hon Member to ask us whether there is any time limit to the Police investigation is with respect to him a nonsensical question, but if he wants a strict answer the answer is no. The Government are not going to put any time limit because they are not in a position to put in a time limit. How the Police carry out their investigations, how they go about it, how long they take, indeed whether they ever finish, indeed whether they ever investigate is a matter entirely for the Police and he is free to write to them. If he is a concerned citizen or as a Member of this House he can write to the Commissioner of Police but he cannot come to this House to ask the Government whether they are going to time-limit the Police in the conduct of an investigation.



**ORAL**

**NO. 55 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

In view of the reply given by the Minister for Sport in answer to Question 2141 of 2004, when he said that works to the changing rooms and spectator facilities for the water based hockey pitch were expected to reach practical completion in February 2005, can he now confirm whether this has happened, and whether the pertinent facilities are now being used both by the public and hockey players?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 56 and 57 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 56 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether the new Sports Hall is now fully operational since he has said in this House that this would happen during the latter part of Autumn of last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 55 and 57 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 57 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether or not the Government have advertised vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The new Sports Hall has been ready for use for some time now and will be used by the public as soon as the staff are employed. The relevant posts have already been advertised and as for the hockey stand it is projected that it will be available for use next month.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 55 TO 57 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how many additional posts are required for the Hall to be opened? He says that they have been advertised. Is it that all the jobs that have been advertised are to be filled?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I am sorry I did not get the last bit.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have all the jobs got to be filled before the Hall can be opened or once they have got a certain number they can proceed?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, all the posts need to be filled before we can proceed. The hon Member may have seen the advert and it is for Sports Attendants and also for an Assistant Sports Development Officer and a Clerical Assistant.

ORAL

**NO. 58 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can Government specify the nature of the proposed infrastructure works at the Victoria Stadium put to tender on the 17<sup>th</sup> March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The infrastructure works put to tender on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2005 for the Bayside Sports Complex consist of the provision of all cable ducts, fresh and salt water services and sewage and surface water drainage systems to service the new sports facilities projected to be constructed west of the new Sports Hall on the reclaimed land.

**ORAL**

**NO. 59 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**LEISURE CENTRE – KINGS BASTION**

Can the Minister for Sport state the estimated date of completion for the leisure centre, which was promised by the GSD in 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Government were elected in November 2003 on their manifesto for that election which does indeed contain a commitment for a leisure centre. It is envisaged that construction works will commence in June this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 59 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In view of the reply from the Minister can he confirm that planning permission has now been given?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

It is a Government project and therefore it does not require planning permission.

**ORAL**

**NO. 60 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state how many local residents are currently registered with the Primary Care Centre under the Group Practice Medical Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 64 to 66, 72 and 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 61 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 62, 63, 69, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 62 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government confirm the total number of in-patient admissions at St Bernard's Hospital for the year 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61, 63, 69, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 63 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61, 62, 69, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 64 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government confirm the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the year 2004, keeping to the format given in answer to Question 2200 and additionally giving details of other departments that were not shown there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 65, 66, 72 and 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 65 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GP ATTENDANCES**

Can Government confirm the number of GP Attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the year 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 64 and 72 to 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 66 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre, including the number of out-patients being attended to by District Nurses, Occupational Therapists and Physiotherapists during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 64, 65 and 72 to 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 67 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital (a) as out-patients and (b) as in-patients during the months of December 2004, January, February and March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 68, 70 and 114 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 68 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm how many non-entitled patients have been admitted to St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 67, 70 and 114 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 69 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF BEDS**

Can Government confirm the total number of beds which there are at St Bernard's Hospital at Europort, also giving a breakdown of how many there are in each ward or unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 70 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIVATE BEDS**

Can Government state whether entitled and/or non-entitled patients can have access to a private bed in St Bernard's Hospital, and if so, what is the cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 67, 68 and 114 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 71 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can Government provide the latest waiting lists for public patients covering all specialities, giving a breakdown of each, for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 85 and 86 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 72 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre Doctors during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 64 to 66 and 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 73 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GP ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP Attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 60**

As the hon Member's Colleague, the Spokesperson for Health would be aware or should be aware, from the time that she was Minister for Health it has never been possible to ascertain the total number of local residents registered with the Group Practice Medical Scheme. While it is theoretically possible to give a breakdown it would involve a disproportionate amount of administrative effort to obtain these statistics.

The other statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I now hand over.

The hon Member may note that in relation to Question No. 64 the figure for dermatology for October 2004 which was provided at the last meeting of the House was a cumulative total for the year to date and should have read 32 and not 185. The figure provided in relation to Question No. 65 for the months of June and September in respect of GP clinics, updates the figures given to the hon Member in answer to Question No. 1588 of 2004.

**Answer to Question 73 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 64**

DEPARTMENT	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	TOTAL
AUDIOLOGY	157	104	178	121	373	280	213	0	198	385	147	191	2,347
DIETICIAN	63	76	83	80	64	70	70	95	94	90	83	53	921
CLINIC SISTER	1140	1428	1577	1264	1243	1165	1247	1224	1597	2320	1637	1258	17,100
SCHOOL HEALTH	460	404	441	377	876	326	357	224	323	298	283	234	4,603
SPEECH & LANGUAGE	8	12	125	271	174	152	67	120	196	224	209	93	1,651
MENTAL WELFARE	272	283	267	238	286	292	277	259	257	206	170	154	2,961
GP CLINIC	7998	7397	9229	7355	8009	8158	8495	7795	9100	8276	8605	8259	98,676
HOUSE CALLS	655	363	564	478	613	442	565	378	549	433	523	635	6,198
DENTAL	1430	1587	1624	1358	1029	1629	1114	1073	1674	1352	1658	1052	16,580
CHILD WELFARE	820	792	849	735	775	812	648	636	807	774	793	648	9,089
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	774	627	340	197	270	356	259	255	348	332	338	406	4,502
DERMATOLOGIST	18	18	18	22	23	19	16	0	19	32	0	196	381
ORTHOPIST	90	79	121	80	87	145	110	64	122	114	121	115	1,248
OPTOMETRIST	165	157	102	170	123	115	162	83	105	121	86	120	1,509
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14050</b>	<b>13327</b>	<b>15518</b>	<b>12746</b>	<b>13945</b>	<b>13961</b>	<b>13600</b>	<b>12206</b>	<b>15389</b>	<b>14957</b>	<b>14653</b>	<b>13414</b>	<b>167766</b>

Cont.....

**Contd to Answer to Question 73 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 64**

**\* COMMUNITY**

DEPARTMENT	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	TOTAL
PHYSIO	83	75	102	81	93	95	105	161	153	196	183	149	1476
OT	156	274	351	286	285	224	313	264	247	310	244	165	3119
DISTRICT	4452	4509	4498	5040	4777	1943	4652	3506	4593	3808	3831	5003	50612
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4691</b>	<b>4858</b>	<b>4951</b>	<b>5407</b>	<b>5155</b>	<b>2262</b>	<b>5070</b>	<b>3931</b>	<b>4993</b>	<b>4314</b>	<b>4258</b>	<b>5317</b>	<b>55207</b>

Figures provided in answer to previous questions in respect of O/T have been for Paediatrics. The figure provided above are the total of adults and paediatrics combined.

**Answer to Question 65**

DEPARTMENT	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	TOTAL
GP CLINICS	7998	7397	9229	7355	8009	8158	8495	7795	9100	8276	8605	8259	98,676

Cont.....

**Contd to Answer to Question 73 of 2005****Answer to Question 66**

DEPARTMENT	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	TOTAL
AUDIOLOGY	191	154	155	171	671
DIETICIAN	53	45	64	75	237
CLINIC SISTER	1258	1302	1662	1722	5,944
SCHOOL HEALTH	234	286	327	260	1,107
SPEECH & LANGUAGE	93	181	228	107	609
MENTAL WELFARE	154	151	184	186	675
GP CLINIC	8259	7803	9513	8700	34,275
HOUSE CALLS	635	692	661	583	2,571
DENTAL	1052	1202	1307	1274	4,835
CHILD WELFARE	648	858	1037	763	3,306
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	406	240	593	724	1,963
DERMATOLOGIST	196	0	76	0	272
ORTHOPIST	115	S.B.H	S.B.H	S.B.H	115
OPTOMETRIST	120	S.B.H	S.B.H	S.B.H	120
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13414</b>	<b>12914</b>	<b>15807</b>	<b>14565</b>	<b>56,700</b>

S.B.H = These clinics are currently being held at St Bernard's Hospital.

**\* COMMUNITY**

PHYSIO	149	157	122	N.F.A	428
OT	38	185	222	191	636
DISTRICT	5003	3713	3671	4906	17293
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5190</b>	<b>4055</b>	<b>4015</b>	<b>5097</b>	<b>18,357</b>

**Answer to Question 72**

DEPARTMENT	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	TOTAL
HOUSE-CALLS	635	692	661	583	2,571

Calls received during working hours are recorded until 4pm. Night calls do not form part of these statistics

**Answer to Question 73**

DEPARTMENT	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	TOTAL
GP CLINIC	8259	7803	9513	8700	34,275

**ORAL**

**NO. 74 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Long Stay Elderly Care Patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69 and 95 to 99 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 75 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 76 to 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 76 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to Pharmacists for periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005 as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 and 77 to 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 77 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for the periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004 and the comparable figure for the same periods in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75, 76 and 78 to 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 78 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS Prescriptions for accounting periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to the dispensing Pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 to 77 and 79 to 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 79 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50, for the accounting periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/05?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 to 78, 80 and 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 80 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/05 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 to 79 and 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 81 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees for periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to him.

The hon Member should note that the information supplied is only in respect of complete periods where all pharmacists have submitted their accounts.

**Answer to Question 81 of 2005****Answer to Question 75**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
Prescriptions	14074	14541	12103	12391	13384
Items	50922	52263	43174	44408	47603
Cost	£601655.25	£620615.84	£498142.67	£512459.67	£546556.60

**Answer to Question 76**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
PAID	£78476.77	£80949.89	£64975.13	£66842.57	£71289.99

**Answer to Question 77**

2004/05 PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
PAID	£91659.60	£94073.40	£49701.00	Nil	Nil

2003/04 PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
PAID	£84346.20	£84454.20	£84193.20	£32768.40	Nil

**Answer to Question 78**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
SCRIPTS	6410	6672	5372	5825	6075
ITEMS	12434	12768	10447	11080	11653

When there are more than three items in a prescription it is not possible to establish which medicines attract the charge and therefore it is not possible to identify what the cost of such medicines are.

**Answer to Question 79**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
NO OF ITEMS	3981	4266	3328	3545	3642

**Answer to Question 80**

When the prescription charges were amended, the Government made all medicines free for pensioners and additionally, after charging only for the first three items on the prescription, supplies all further medicines completely free of charge.

It is not possible to calculate the extra revenue raised within any degree of accuracy but it is estimated to be in the region of £32K for periods 7,8,9,10 and 11 of 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question 81**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
DISPENSING FEES	£91659.60	£94073.40	£49701.00	-	-



**ORAL**

**NO. 82 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether scheduled surgery has now commenced for specialities other than Gynaecology?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 83, 84, 103, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 83 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

In connection with the third Review Team recommendation, which relates to scheduled surgery in the speciality of Gynaecology, can the Minister for Health now confirm how many patients have taken up the offer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82, 84, 103, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 84 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

In view of the answer given by the Minister for Health in reply to Question 2241 of 2004, when he confirmed that scheduling surgery in Gynaecology began in October and that the pilot initiative will go live in the new year, can he now confirm whether this has been the case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82, 83, 103, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 85 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons there are presently waiting for elective surgery in each speciality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 71 and 86 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 86 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF OPERATIONS**

Can Government confirm how many operations were performed in St Bernard's at Europort, for the months of February and March 2005, by specialities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule which I hand over.

### Answer to Question 71

The out-patient's public and private waiting times by specialities are as follows:

Speciality	Public Clinic	Public Surgeon
Otorhinolaryngology	Adults 6 weeks. Children 8 weeks.	Adults 24 months. Children 12 months.
General Surgery	20 weeks.	Up to 1 year depending on procedure.
General Medicine	7-9 weeks.	
Paediatrics	3 weeks.	
Ophthalmology	10 weeks.	Routine surgery 2 months. Cataract surgery 6 weeks.
Geriatrics	1 week.	
Pain Clinic	1 week.	
Psychiatry	1-3 weeks.	
Gynaecology	Urgent cases 1 day. 1 week for cases requiring attention soon. 4 weeks for routine cases.	1 week for urgent cases. 3 weeks for cases requiring attention soon. 12 weeks for routine surgery.
Orthopaedics	Urgent cases 1 day. 2 weeks for cases requiring attention soon. 7 months for routine cases.	Waiting time for surgery varies from 2 weeks depending on intervention.

There is no waiting time for emergencies.

Cont'd.....

### Cont'd Answer to Question 86 of 2005

#### Answer to Question 85

<b>Otorhinolaryngology</b>	189
<b>General Surgery</b>	110
<b>Ophthalmology</b>	48
<b>Orthopaedics</b>	347
<b>Gynaecology &amp; Obstetrics</b>	76

(In the process of validation)

#### Answer to Question 85

February 2005 as from 12.2.2005

	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
<b>Ear, Nose and Throat</b>	5	12
<b>General Surgery</b>	9	58
<b>Gynaecology &amp; Obstetrics</b>	10	30
<b>Orthodontics</b>	3	23
<b>Orthopaedics</b>	9	29
<b>Plastic Surgery</b>	0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>158</b>

**NO. 87 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DIALYSIS TREATMENT**

Can Government confirm whether patients requiring dialysis treatment will be transported by St John Ambulance to the Europort hospital, once the facilities there are fully operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The clinical needs for transportation to St Bernard's Hospital for dialysis will be assessed on a case by case basis in line with protocols currently being developed for the patient transfer service provided by St John Ambulance.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 87 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is there any explanation the Government can offer as to why the dialysis unit is not functioning yet within the hospital, because we were assured in this House that as soon as the hospital was operational the dialysis unit would also be operational?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This House was assured of nothing of the sort. This House was told that the dialysis unit would be opened as soon as it was ready. The explanation I can give the hon Member is that the main reason is that at a reasonably late stage there was a decision to change the initial location of the dialysis unit to a better location, one which will provide dialysis patients with a view of the harbour, remember these patients are in a chair for three hours sometimes two and three times a week, and the policy decision was made that it was a good idea to accept the inherent delay in the change of location and the consequent work that needed to be done in view of the benefits to the patient. That was the main reason.



**HON C A BRUZON:**

I remember clearly that even though I was not shadowing the Minister for Health I did intervene personally and I asked that question so I would have to check Hansard to see if what I say is correct. I am pretty sure that the Minister did say that the dialysis machine would be operational when the new hospital opened or words to that effect.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If I said that then that is absolutely correct that the dialysis unit would be open once the new hospital was open.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The Minister was implying in terms of time of chronology that it would happen when the hospital was open.

**ORAL**

**NO. 88 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DIALYSIS TREATMENT**

Can Government confirm whether patients requiring dialysis treatment will be transported by St John's Ambulance service to the Europort hospital, once the facilities there are fully operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Same as Question No. 87 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 89 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for Scans in December of 2004, January, February and March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 90 to 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 90 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ALGECIRAS CLINIC**

Can Government confirm how much has the Gibraltar Health Authority spent to date in sending patients to the Algeciras clinic for scans during the financial year 2004/05 with the comparable figures for the same period last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89 and 91 to 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 91 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as Sponsored Patients, and have elected to go to Spain during the months of November, December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89, 90 and 92 to 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 92 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm that a number of sponsored patients have been informed by the Gibraltar Health Authority that they are unable to provide them with the relevant allowances on time due to a shortage of funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89 to 91, 93 and 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 93 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS**

Can the Government state from January 2005 to March 2005, what has now been the number of patient referrals to the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89 to 92 and 94 of 2005.

**NO. 94 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Government state from January 2005 to end of March 2005 what has been the number of Sponsored Patients treated in the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question 92**

At no point has the Gibraltar Health Authority informed sponsored patients that they are unable to provide them with the relevant allowances on time due to a shortage of funds.

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to him.



**Answer to Question 94 of 2005****Answer to Question 89**

The amount paid to clinics in Malaga for Scans in December 2004, January, February and March of 2005 were as follows:-

December 2004	£881.01
January 2005	£851.24
February 2005	£429.75
March 2005	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2162.00</b>

**Answer to Question 90**

The cost of scans in the Algeciras Clinic during the financial year 2004/05 with the comparable figures for the same period last year is as follows:-

2003-04	£221,173.09
2004-05	£207,532.88

**Answer to Question 91**

All patients are given the choice to be treated in Spain as opposed to the UK at the time of referral when considered appropriate by the referring Consultant. 152 patients out of 608 have elected to go to Spain during the months of November, December 2004, January, February, and March 2005.

**Answer to Question 93**

The number of patient referrals to the UK during financial year 04/05 was 1258 referrals. The cost identified to date is £2,656,028 (This figure is subject to change, as accounts have not yet been finalised).

The comparable figures for financial year 03/04 are 1164 referrals at a cost of £1,556,402. The quota system was still operating that year.

**Answer to Question 94**

The number of sponsored patients treated in the UK during financial year 04/05 was 753 patients. The cost identified to date is £2,656,028 (This figure is subject to change, as accounts have not yet been finalised)

The comparable figures for financial year 03/04 are 679 patients at a cost of £1,556,402. The quota system was still operating that year.

The figures provided for Question 93 and 94 are cumulative figures from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004. These will take account of any adjustments that have been made on the cost previously provided and which were identified as being subject to change. To produce the figures as requested will also entail having to produce three sets of figures and enter into a reconciliation process which would involve a disproportionate amount of administrative effort.

**ORAL**

**NO. 95 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm the total number of patients who are presently occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital giving a breakdown by sex and age and in which ward or unit they are in?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74 and 96 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 96 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can the Government state, in relation to the total number of patients presently occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital, how many of them are situated in each ward or unit, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74, 95 and 97 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 97 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of December 2004, January, February and March of 2005, of the beds occupied by Elderly persons who have been formally discharged from St Bernard's Hospital, how many fell into each of the 3 categories identified by the Government specifying sex and age:-

- 1) Elderly persons living alone;
- 2) Elderly persons needing support;
- 3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74, 95, 96 and 98 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 98 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Elderly Citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of March 2005, giving a breakdown of sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74, 95 to 97 and 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 99 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Psycho-Geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV during the months of December 2004, January, February and March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule which I hand over.

**Answer to Question 99 of 2005****Answer to Question 61**

	December 2004	January 2005	February 2005	March 2005
Admissions	395	369	338	459
Average	152	153	134	133

**Answer to Question 62**

The total number of inpatient admissions at St Bernard's Hospital for the year 2004 was 5925.

**Answer to Question 63**

	December 2004	January 2005	February 2005	March 2005
A & E Clinics	1658	1645	1569	1920
A & E Dressings	631	376	305	357
Clinics	1179	1229	304	1249
Orthoptist	115	63	0	0
Optometrist	120	94	28	62
Physiotherapy	522	448	434	450
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4225</b>	<b>3855</b>	<b>2640</b>	<b>4038</b>

**Answer to Question 69**

WARD	NO OF BEDS	BEDS IN USE
Emily McIntosh	11	11
Rainbow	21	21
Victoria McIntosh	30	30
John McIntosh	30	30
Dudley Toomey	30	30
Cap Murchison	30	30
James Giraldi	13	5
A & E	2	2
Day Surgery	8	8
Reserved Ward	30	0
Reserved Ward	10	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>167</b>

**Answer to Question 74**

DECEMBER 2004				JANUARY 2005		
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
61-70	6	3	9	8	8	16
71-80	8	9	17	7	10	17
81-90	6	33	31	6	37	43
91+	4	9	13	5	9	14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>90</b>

FEBRUARY 2005				MARCH 2005		
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
61-70	12	8	20	8	6	14
71-80	9	12	21	5	13	18
81-90	8	34	42	4	9	13
91+	6	9	15	3	4	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>52</b>

Contd..

**Cont'd Answer to Question 99 of 2005**

**Answer to Questions 95 and 96**

	Male	Age Group	Female	Age Group	Total
Emily Mackintosh	3	0 to 10	2	21 to 30	5
			1	31 to 40	1
Rainbow	2	0 to 10			2
	1	11 to 20	1	11 to 20	2
Victoria McIntosh			1	21 to 30	1
			1	41 to 50	1
			3	51 to 60	3
			2	61 to 70	2
			4	71 to 80	4
	1		9	81 to 90	10
			8	91 +	8
John McIntosh	1	21 to 30			1
	1	41 to 50			1
	1	51 to 60	2	51 to 60	3
			1	61 to 70	1
	3	71 to 80	2	71 to 80	5
	7	81 to 90	4	81 to 90	11
	4	91 +	2	91 +	6
Dudley Toomey	1	31 to 40	1	30 to 40	2
	2	41 to 50	0		2
	2	51 to 60	0		2
	1	61 to 70	2	60 to 70	3
	2	71 to 80	2	71 to 80	4
	4	81 to 90	2	81 to 90	6
	2	91 +	3	91 +	5
Capt Murchison	2	41 to 50	0		2
	2	71 to 80	1	70 to 80	3
	1	81 to 90	5	81 to 90	6
	2	91 +	2	91 +	4
James Giraldi	1	41 to 50	0		1
			1	61 to 70	1
	2	71 to 80	0		2
	1	81 to 90	0		1

**Total No. of patients      111**

Cont....



**Cont'd Answer to Question 99 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 97**

DECEMBER 2004				JANUARY 2005			
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	
61-70	0	1	1	0	1	1	
71-80	1	2	3	2	3	5	
81-90	3	2	5	2	3	5	
91+	0	1	1	0	1	1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	

FEBRUARY 2005				MARCH 2005			
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	
61-70	0	1	1	0	1	1	
71-80	2	3	5	3	3	6	
81-90	2	2	4	2	2	4	
91+	0	1	1	0	1	1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	

All elderly patients require some sort of support be it physical, emotional or social.

All patients who have been officially discharged are able to be looked after.

**Answer to Question 98**

A total of 48 persons were on the waiting list for admission to the John Mackintosh Homes as at 21 April, 2005. Of these, the following were in St Bernard's Hospital, classified by age and sex.

AGE	MALE	FEMALE
71 TO 80		1
81 TO 90	2	4
91 +	2	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>

**Answer to Question 99**

6 Psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted into KGV during this period.

**ORAL**

**NO. 100 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

In view of the statement made by the Minister for Health during the last meeting of the House on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2004, in answer to Question 2166 of 2004, can he now confirm whether he has read the report that was carried out by the City Fire Brigade dated 19 November 1998 in relation to the KGV Psychiatric Unit and, if so, is he satisfied that its recommendations were implemented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 101 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 101 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether he is satisfied that since 1998, after the review of the City Fire Brigade was carried out in relation to KGV Psychiatric Unit, the necessary installation of equipment for Fire Prevention, or the measures required for dealing with the onset of a fire have been adequate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

I have read the report of the City Fire Brigade dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 1998 captioned KGV Hospital. As the hon Member is aware, there was a recent incident at KGV which is the subject of a Coroner's investigation and the Government consider it inappropriate to comment on any matter related to the incident.

**ORAL**

**NO. 102 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MRSA INFECTION**

Can the Government confirm how many cases there have been of MRSA Infection within St Bernard's Hospital since 1996 to the present time and how many of them have been fatal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Since 1996, 18 patients have been treated for MRSA acquired within St Bernard's Hospital. In one case MRSA was determined to be a contributing factor to the cause of death.

During the same period, 40 patients returned to Gibraltar with MRSA infections which were acquired while being treated in health facilities abroad. A further 59 patients were also treated for MRSA infections acquired from elsewhere.

According to The Director of Public Health, there has been no other death directly attributable to MRSA infection.

**ORAL**

**NO. 103 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT TEAM**

Can Government confirm whether they are expecting to receive any recommendations from the Clinical Governance Audit Team with regard to the KGV Psychiatric Unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 104 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CT SCAN**

Can Government state whether the CT Scan at St Bernard's Hospital is operational, and if not, when is it expected to be?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The CT Scanner was tested and fully commissioned prior to the opening of the hospital. It has been ready for regular use since 14<sup>th</sup> February 2005. The services will be initiated as soon as a suitably experienced radiologist has been recruited.

**ORAL**

**NO. 105 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STRESS MACHINE**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether authorisation has been given by those who donated the treadmill, so that it can be upgraded and used for stress testing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The position remains as stated in answer to Question No. 1539 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO. 106 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Are Government now in a position to confirm the staff composition of the Pain Clinic, and if so, does it coincide with the recommendations of the Health Care Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 107 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can the Government confirm what is the distribution of nurses by wards and departments at St Bernard's Hospital, Europort, specifying their grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 108 and 136 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 108 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can the Government confirm how many contract nurses are employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of March 2005, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 107 and 136 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 109 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NEW POSTS**

Can Government confirm whether any new posts have been created within the Gibraltar Health Authority during the financial year 2004/05, and if so, can they give the grade and salary of such posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 110, 116 and 117 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 110 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NEW POSTS**

Can Government confirm whether any new posts have been created within the Civil Service, which contribute to the running of the Europort hospital, and if so, can they give the grade and salary of such posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 109, 116 and 117 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 111 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether they have now renewed those contracts which were due to expire before or in January 2005, for Medical Practitioners?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 112, 113 and 115 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 112 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government give details of any new arrangements or contracts they have entered into with Medical Practitioners of the Gibraltar Health Authority relating to Private Practice?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 111, 113 and 115 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 113 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether there have been any changes in the Job Descriptions of Medical Practitioners working within the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 111, 112 and 115 of 2005.

**NO. 114 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DENTAL OFFICERS**

Can Government confirm whether Dental Officers will be allowed to carry out Private Practice outside their normal working hours as employees of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 67**

As from 1 December 2004, no private medicine is being practised within the GHA. Patients who are neither entitled to receive free treatment under the provisions of any legislation nor a reciprocal agreement which may be in force may be charged a fee payable to the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 68**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I now hand over.

**Answer to Question No. 70**

There are no designated private beds in St Bernard's Hospital

The charges to which the hon Member refers are set out in the Hospital Rules. These were last increased when the hon Lady was in office in 1989 and are now under review.

**Answer to Question No. 114**

Dental Officers may on receipt of permission from the Chief Executive carry out private practice outside the normal working hours outside the GHA premises.



**Answer to Question 114 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 68**

	<b>In-Patients</b>	<b>Out-Patients</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	2	3
<b>January 2005</b>	3	3
<b>February 2005</b>	5	1
<b>March 2005</b>	9	8

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 67, 68, 70 AND 114 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Will the Minister explain what he means when he says that there are fees specified and there are no private rooms designated within the new hospital?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

There are no private rooms and there are no private patients and there is no private practice, and I would take this opportunity to point out that this question has been asked twice in this meeting and the last meeting of the House, and if it is asked again the answer will remain the same. It is just to avoid confusion because if I am being asked to make a statement of policy, the policy that was taken was made at the last meeting and is made here again, that there is no private practice so there is no point in repeating the question as has been repeated on this occasion. I am just saying this for the benefit of the hon Member.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I am not talking about private practice, I am talking about private rooms.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I understand, if given time I will answer again. There are charges, there is a list of charges in the Hospital Rules which are applicable to people who are not entitled to receive free medicine, as may be an emergency case coming in from across the border, or an accident in Main Street or a tourist off a ship, and those are the fees that are applicable in the case of a non-entitled patient who is, for example, not a member of the GPMS. Those fees, as I said, were last reviewed back in the historic times and are currently being reviewed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say whether in fact there have been any instances of dental officers being given permission by the Chief Executive to carry out private practice or not?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would need notice of that question. Not that I am aware of, it has not crossed my desk and I have not been informed but I hesitate from saying no in case it has happened.

**NO. 115 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

In view of the answer given to Question 2146 of 2004, can Government confirm that it is their policy that before the GHA decides whether or not to extend the contracts for Medical Practitioners, their performance requires to be reviewed by external assessors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 111**

Five General Practitioners contracts due to expire in January 2005 have been renewed.

**Answer to Question No. 112**

Consultant Medical staff and General Practitioners may provide private practice outside contracted hours and off GHA premises only on the permission of the Chief Executive.

**Answer to Question No. 113**

The job descriptions for the General Practitioners are under review in discussion with the GPs themselves.

**Answer to Question No. 115**

As stated in answer to Question No. 2146 of 2004, it is the GHA policy to review the performance of all officers prior to any contract extension. With respect to the clinical performance of General Practitioners at the GHA, these have all been reviewed by external assessors.

**ORAL**

**NO. 116 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – EXECUTIVE TEAM**

Can Government confirm whether the Administrative support for the new Executive Team of the Gibraltar Health Authority has now been finalised?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 109, 110 and 117 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 117 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – EXECUTIVE TEAM**

Can Government confirm whether the Administrative Support for the new Executive Team of the Gibraltar Health Authority will mean that new posts will be or have been created?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 110**

Although officers from other Government Departments have been seconded to the Gibraltar Health Authority, no new posts have been created within the Civil Service which contribute to the running of the Europort Hospital.

**Answer to Question Nos. 109, 116 and 117**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 117 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 109, 116 & 117**

The post of Chief Executive/Director of Finance was split up into two separate posts thus creating one extra post. This is reflected in the list of new posts created during the financial year 2004/2005 as detailed below:

No of Posts	Grade	Salary	Remarks
1	Chief Executive	£106,000	
1	Human Resources Director	£60,758	
1	Deputy Director of Operations	£53,128	
1	Patient Complaints Co-ordinator	£26,248	
3	Operating Department Practitioner	£19,093	
1	Orthopaedic Surgeon	£87,025	(being recruited)
1	General Surgeon	£101,480	(Arriving in May)
2	Consultant Anaesthetist	£87,025	(1 to be recruited)
1	TSSU/CSSD Manager	£22,247*	
7	TSSU/CSSD Technician	£13,483*	(2 to be recruited)
		£13,109*	
		£12,028*	
		£13,109*	
		£13,483*	
7	Receptionist (5 Whole Time Equivalents)	£11,871	
1	Catering Director	£27,718	
1	Senior House Officer	£86,886	
3	Executive Officer	£23,234	(1 to be transferred)
1	IT Support Assistant	£13,024	
5	Administrative Officer	£19,334	(4 to be transferred)
3	Personal Secretary (Executive Team Support)	£19,817	(1 to be transferred)
1	Consultant Paediatrician	£87,025	(Arriving in Sept)
1	Senior Radiographer I	£22,567 to £26,937**	(Arriving in May)
2	Senior Radiographer II	£19,002 to £24,192**	(1 arriving in May)
2	Biomedical Scientist	£16,323 to £19,860**	
1	JMISO	£11,323	
6	Staff Nurses (Critical Care ITU)	£16,548 to £22,247**	(4 arriving in May)
8	Staff Nurses (Day Surgery)	£16,548 to £22,247**	(being recruited)
1	Building Maintenance Officer-PTO	£16,672 to £28,002**	(being recruited)
5	Labourers	£12,396	(to be transferred)
6	Handyman/Craftsman	£15,481	(5 transferred from Community Project April 05)
11	Domestics P/T (5½ Whole Time Equivalents)	£12,396	(to be recruited)
1	IT Support Officer	£29,000	(Transferred from ETB)

\* Salary on a Personal to Holder basis

\*\* Salary dependent on years of experience

ORAL

**NO. 118 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR**

Can the Government state which is the grade and salary of the newly created post of Complaints Co-ordinator for the handling of official complaints within the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 119 to 121 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 119 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been dealt with by the Complaints Co-ordinator, which have not been passed on to officially to the Independent Review Panel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 118, 120 and 121 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 120 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how often the members of the new Independent Complaints Review Panel have now met to consider complaints from users of our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 118, 119 and 121 of 2005.

**NO. 121 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been lodged with the new Independent Review Panel since it started to function to the end of March 2005, from users of the Health Services, specifying the date of each complaint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 118**

For pay purposes the Complaints Co-ordinator is analogued to the Higher Executive Officer pay scale and the salary is £26,248 per annum.

**Answer to Question No. 119**

As at 20<sup>th</sup> April 2005, 49 complaints have been handled exclusively by the Complaints Co-ordinator without request by the complainant for referral to the Independent Review Panel.

**Answer to Question Nos. 120 and 121**

To date only one complaint has been lodged with the Independent Review Panel. The panel is an independent body and the Government are therefore not aware of how often its members have met to consider this single complaint.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 118 TO 121 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could I ask the Minister who appoints the Independent Panel?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Under the Ordinance the Minister chooses a number of fit and proper persons the names of which are published in the Gazette and then as a case arises the Ombudsman picks from that, because the complaint is referred to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman picks from that panel which, if my memory serves me is 18 people, picks three people from that panel to serve on that particular complaint.

**ORAL**

**NO. 122 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government state whether the review by the Health Care Development Team with regards to the Pathology Department and the Laboratory has been undertaken, and if so, can they state if any recommendations have been accepted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 106, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 123 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DISTRICT COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can the Government now confirm, in view of the replies given by the Minister for Health, in answer to Question 826 of 2004, 1589 of 2004, and 2217 of 2004, whether they intend to improve resources within the District Community Service as recommended by the Healthcare Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 106, 122, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 124 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CATERING SERVICE**

Can Government state whether they have employed any persons on fixed contract terms to manage the Catering Service provided to St Bernard's Hospital, either directly or through the use of a contracting company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 125 to 127 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 125 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEALS**

Can Government state whether they are aware that there are complaints from many patients in St Bernard's Hospital at the Europort Building, that the meals being delivered to them in trays, from the Kitchen which is now situated in the old wine factory area, are arriving cold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 124, 126 and 127 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 126 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - MEALS**

In view of the reply given to Question 2238 of 2004 by the Minister for Health, when he confirmed that a total of 13 catering staff were involved in the production of meals for St Bernard's Hospital and that the transport of such meals and domestic units would also be provided within the current staffing provision, whether any extra financial compensation is being paid to the staff for having to transport the meals from the old wine factory area to Europort?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 124, 125 and 127 of 2005.



**NO. 127 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - MEALS**

Can Government state whether they intend to engage a private company to manage the production of meals which is being transported to St Bernard's Hospital from the old wine factory area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 124**

Government can confirm that the post of Catering Director has been taken up on a GHA contract for two years.

**Answer to Question No. 125**

Government are aware that when the service first started there were some complaints of the meals arriving cold. Temperature and quality audits were put into place and remedial measures were taken immediately. This service is audited on a weekly basis.

**Answer to Question No. 126**

There is no extra financial compensation being paid to staff for transporting meals to the hospital.

**Answer to Question No. 127**

The production of meals is being carried out by GHA staff and the management of this service is also carried out by GHA staff.

**ORAL**

**NO. 128 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can Government confirm how much is the expected total expenditure in respect of the Clinical Governance Audit they have commissioned for our health services, since the answer was not given by them in reply to question 877 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 106, 122, 123 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 129 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for study leave, up to the end of March 2004/2005, which is included in sub-head 30, School of Health Studies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The total expenditure for study leave for staff attending courses overseas is £73,884.51. This is composed of £21,006.03 in Course fees and £43,398.97 in Subsistence and £9,479.51 in travel.

**ORAL**

**NO. 130 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COST OF ACCOMMODATION**

Can Government now confirm what is the final figure for accommodation, under Sub-Head 22 in the financial year 2003/2004 and the forecast outturn for the financial year 2004/2005 of the Gibraltar Health Authority, replies to which have not been given to the same question in two previous meetings of the House, namely Question 814 of 2004, and 2160 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 131 and 132 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 131 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – RENTAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTIES**

Can the Government give the names of the owners of all the Private Properties the Gibraltar Health Authority has been renting from the beginning of 2003 to the present time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 130 and 132 of 2005.

**NO. 132 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – RENTAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTIES**

Now that the Government have confirmed that the GHA have been renting properties in respect of which the lessor is in breach of the terms of the underlease, which prohibits renting, what action has been taken to rectify the situation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 132**

The Government have not confirmed that the GHA have been renting properties in respect of which the lessor is in breach of the terms of the underlease. The GHA contracts with Estate Agents when renting private properties. Ensuring that the lessee is acting in compliance with the terms of the underlease is the responsibility of the lessor and not of the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 131**

At the time contracts are signed, GHA has never obliged the Estate Agents to provide details of the names of the owners in respect of the private properties that they lease. On receipt of the hon Member's question, the GHA have requested this information from the estate agents concerned. They have provided it to the GHA but on a confidential basis. I am therefore unable to provide the information to the hon Member. With the exception of one estate agent who acts for himself but I can disclose that name because we have been given permission to say that Mr Momy Levy who owns a number of flats, has in the past hired flats to the GHA acting as his own estate agent and we have been authorised to release this information, but I am not authorised to release information on behalf of the other estate agents.

**Answer to Question No. 130**

The spend on accommodation under Subhead 22 in 2003/2004 and the forecast outturn for the financial year 2004/2005 are as follows:-

<b>2003/2004</b>	<b>2004/2005</b>
£329,969.03	£387,000

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 130 TO 132 OF 2005**

### **HON F R PICARDO:**

The clear reason for the question at No. 132 was that we had received in this House an answer to a question previously put by Miss Montegriffo where the Minister for Health disclosed that the Health Authority was renting a number of properties at Montagu Gardens, Harbour Views, one of the developments where I think all of us are aware there is a restriction on the under-lessee from renting. This really is what we are trying to determine to see whether the Government have been able to get to the bottom of whether those flats it was renting at Montagu Gardens or any of those other places were in fact being rented in breach of the leases granted by the Government in their incarnation as landlord, although of course I accept that the GHA is an independent statutory body, but the Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority, the Minister is a Member of the Government. Really what we are trying to do is get to the bottom of whether that is being dealt with.

### **HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I hear what the hon Member is saying but let us look at what has happened in relation to both questions. The last meeting of the House, the question did not ask for the name of the owners, the question was on the lines of what accommodation is GHA providing to staff nurses, to the Chief Executive, to a number of people specified by name. The question asked for addresses, not names of the owners of the property. I answered the question on the basis of providing the location and not the address because I thought it was inappropriate to say there is a doctor living at such an address, or a nurse living at such an address and link it to a name. So I answered the question in the last meeting of the House generically in saying we have rented flats in whatever it was, Montagu Gardens, Harbour Views or whatever. This led to the question being asked by the hon Member the under leases do not permit renting. She subsequently wrote to me, the Opposition Member spokesman for Health, she subsequently wrote to me and I replied to her on the lines I have replied today saying firstly that the houses were 100 per cent owned and there was no Government involvement in the under lease. Secondly, that as far as I was concerned, as I have said today, responsibility for ensuring that the terms of the under lease are complied with is a civic matter between the lessor, whether it be the developer or the management company and the owner of the property. The question today as opposed to the last time asks for the name of the owners of the property, it does not ask for the addresses. I am quite happy in relation to another question, I am quite happy to provide on the same generic basis, I am happy to provide not addresses but the Estates where GHA is renting property but I am specifically stopped by correspondence with the estate agents from releasing the names of the owners, but GHA has no difficulty in saying we are renting in Montagu Gardens or in Harbour Views.

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just say something. The political thrust of the hon Member's question is, are the Government renting property in estates where, are the Government or the GHA we are not to make defined distinction between the two. Is the GHA renting property in estates leased from the Crown the underlease of which contains prohibition against renting, implicit in the question is the insinuation if it were then there is

something quite odd about that because surely the Government have an interest in enforcing the Crown's covenants rather than in aiding and abetting in their breach and frustration. I think we may as well get to the root of the problem, it appears that the GHA has been doing that because it has not been taking care to check the underlease. Whether or not the Government should be allowing the GHA to rent on that basis is a question which will now be under review and I think the GHA are now on notice and perhaps they ought to be more careful in the flats that they rent. It is not usual for a short-term let to lead the rentor, the tenant, to check the root of title, the document of title, it is quite unusual, one would not expect the ordinary man in the street to go through all that trouble. Whether the Government and the GHA as institutions of state so to speak should go to that trouble is moot, at the end of the day now they are on notice they have a greater onus to form a view on that question. Of course whether the Government then choose to enforce their covenants, actually it may not even be the Government it may even be a company, whether some other legal entity linked or not linked to the Government decides to enforce its covenants under the lease is a wholly different question, but I accept the political thrust of the point being made and the insinuations underlying it, although they have not actually articulated it themselves.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There are many dimensions to this issue of course because people who have bought in those estates have bought homes in those estates. One of the issues that the Chief Minister says is that it should not be incumbent on a party taking a lease to check the root of title, I agree with that. I think most people in Gibraltar, at least those of us who are politically aware, know that those estates were developed as homes, they were not put on the market so that people could buy them and then market them as rental properties and in fact, the very fact that the underleases prevent those properties from being rented should affect their value. They cannot be bought to rent and I think it is important that we should highlight this because of course there are many people in that estate, I am sure, who have not put their houses out to rent when perhaps they have wanted to move somewhere else, on the basis that the underlease does not allow them to do it. Obviously one of the reasons for that is to prevent speculation driving up the prices of property on those estates, although we can argue forever about why they are already as high as they are, but I am grateful for the indication that now that this has been highlighted the GHA is likely not to want to continue to lend itself to a breach of those leases.



**NO. 133 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT CHAIRS**

Can Government confirm whether the ward chairs in St Bernard's Hospital at Europort have been or will be replaced due to their slippery condition which has already led to patients falling off them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The patient chairs at St Bernard's Hospital are of two types. One type is the chairs transferred from the old hospital that are called Buxton chairs and these are more suitable for the more elderly patient.

The second type, the new patient chairs recently purchased, are the type most ergonomically and clinically suitable for an acute patient such as someone who is recovering from surgery. These were purchased as part of the procurement of the new hospital.

These new chairs purchased for the wards had been procured from Huntley Nesbitt Evans, a firm in the UK, who are the NHS approved supplier for patient chairs. These chairs are produced to ISO 9000 Standards and all of these products have been tested to ensure conformance with strength and stability standards BS 4875.

Following one reported incident in which a cushion moved from the seat of one of the new chairs while a patient was sitting on it, management has taken additional precautions and have made the decision to further anchor the cushions using Velcro strapping.

**NO. 134 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CAR PARKING**

Can Government confirm when the car parking spaces, which they have acquired from Europlaza, will be available for the public who need access to the Europort Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The GHA has not yet adopted any policy decision with regard to the use of car parking spaces in Europlaza.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 134 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I was under the impression, I think by the answer given a few months ago, that in about a year's time parking spaces would be available in the Europlaza for use of the hospital.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is indeed correct. They will be available for the public. I may have misread the thrust of the question. The use by the public I took to mean the actual conditions whether it will be a public only car park or whether it will also be for members of staff. That finer detail has not yet been established as policy but whether it will be available for the public the answer is clearly yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question is not that unless they are looking at different Order Papers, the question is when will they become available?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that has also been answered previously. It is outside the control of the Government or of GHA. The Government have purchased the floor space but until the building is finished, the developer hands over the building, they cannot be acquired. On present forecasts, depending on who one asks, they vary from the end of the year to the middle of next year so I cannot with any authority say when but indeed it was said last time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The hon Gentleman may scoff but this is a large investment by the GHA, the fact that the Government's forward planning in relation to the hospital was not sufficiently precise to ensure that parking was going to be available means that people now have to pay exorbitant amounts at Safeways if they want to use the parking closest to the hospital, and all we are doing is try to determine whether the development which is going to provide the parking is going apace and the Government expectation is that the parking is going to be provided at least in the first half of next year. Developments slip as we know, they are often delivered late, we are just trying to determine whether at the moment it is still the first half of next year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not accept the premise of the hon Member's supplementary question. The Government do not accept that the question now under discussion has anything to do with bad, good, indifferent forward planning.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It still leaves the people who want to park.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

But that is a different issue. The Government have moved St Bernard's Hospital from an old building which did not enjoy any parking facilities and which had much less street parking available around it in the public highways than this one does, to a building which also does not have, it has more subterranean parking than St Bernard's had by the way, and which is located in an area where the street parking availability, however insufficient it may be, is less acute than it was in the old St Bernard's Hospital. So the existing situation, however unsatisfactory it might be, is already an improvement on where we came from when the hospital was situated in Castle Road. So it has nothing to do with forward planning, it was always envisaged, known and anticipated that the only place in that area of Gibraltar where a car parking dedicated to the hospital, exclusively for the hospital, could be procured, given that a previous Government had alienated the site next to it for private development, was by acquiring a floor of that private development to provide a car park and it was always known that that development would not be ready in time for the new hospital. It was therefore always known that there would be a period whilst the new hospital was up and running and the new parking would not be available and therefore it is not a question of the quality of the forward planning. It was always in the plan that this situation would be so and of course, those who leased out, those

who sold then Safeways a large chunk of public land so that they could build a private car park for their private supermarket are not well placed to now complain to the Government that the Government are unable to deliver public parking in that private supermarket's car park. There is nothing that we can do about that. *[Interruption]* I am sorry, the hon Member in his supplementary question raised the question of people having to park and pay for parking in Safeways. I would not have raised this point if he had not raised it. He cannot point to what is now Morrisons supermarket as if it was something that the Government could do something about. The Government in fact are talking, and the hon Member has another question in the Order Paper, the Minister for Health is talking to Morrisons to see if they will play ball but at the end of the day that land was leased to them, it is therefore private property and it is up to them to decide who they allow to park, what hours and on what basis and it was not this Government that created that situation. So the hon Member might wish to criticise other aspects of the matter but he cannot attribute to this Government the fact that that piece of land is a private car park and not a public car park.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The hon Gentleman is keen to keep going back to things that happened 15 years ago in order to defend his actions less than five years ago to make a decision to put the hospital into an office block opposite a plot which had already been leased out to a supermarket and next to a plot that had at the same time as the building lease for Europort been granted, had also been leased out to other parties. The fact of the matter is that this is obviously the effects of putting a hospital into an office block and putting it into an office block where they put it. Of course, if we had developed a hospital from scratch on the green fields site, then that hospital could have had its own parking and we would not have been dependent on the Minister for Health having to go to Morrisons to ask them to be allowed to park at their parking cheaply in the future. These are the consequences of decisions badly taken.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well no, I think we are in serious danger of re-opening old, political debate here but of course the hon Member's point is almost totally academic because of course, for him to debate the merits or demerits of the choice of location given that in that particular Election Campaign it is clear that they had no intention whatsoever of building a new hospital anywhere and therefore the parking situation would have continued to be indefinitely, as it was during the eight years that they were in Government, as bad and as unavailable and as acute as it has historically been at St Bernard's, and that it was only when they realised that our manifesto contained a promise for a new hospital that they rushed to the printers and inserted a sheet of paper, on different gloss paper, to insert the hospital. So that is the first starting position. If we are here debating whether the parking available for the new hospital is adequate or inadequate, the first thing that we should recognise is that we are only debating that at all because this party was elected into Government. Had this party not been elected into Government there would not have been a new hospital and therefore there would not have been a debate about whether the parking around it was adequate or inadequate. Secondly, what we are debating is the fact that for a period of time which stretches from pre-eight months until the Europlaza building has been completed, the parking situation around the new hospital will not be as it is intended to be permanently. So the very worst that the hon Member can say is that how terribly inconvenient that the enjoyment of this new hospital insofar as parking is

concerned, is not going to be as good as it could have been from day one because we are going to have to wait about 12 months before we can enjoy the car park. Well we think that that is a small price to pay frankly for the splendid hospital. Almost everybody in Gibraltar except the Opposition Members are willing to acknowledge the splendour of the new hospital. I think frankly, their unwillingness to even acknowledge that, even to say well yes it is a smashing hospital, we of course would have built it somewhere else and we would have built a smashing hospital somewhere else too but their continued unwillingness to demonstrate any degree of recognition of the quality of the hospital that has been built, I think speaks for itself. Frankly, if we have to wait another 12 months before we have a further enhancement of our hospital facilities, over and above the huge enhancements that the new hospital itself provides, and that is wait until the construction of the building next door is done so that we can have hospital parking, the answer to his supplementary question is, he will recall that he ended his statements with the words '*are they not*', therefore the answer to the supplementary question is no.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case the question must be this because the Chief Minister has for the first time I think in many years of understanding the legal rules about what somebody does or does not know, made the great mistake of purporting to know what the intentions of others were. Of course there was an intention to develop a hospital on the green fields site, whatever he may say, he will at least accept that he is not able to determine what the intention of another person is. That is a basic legal rule.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We can analyse the circumstantial evidence.

**NO. 135 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE TEAM**

What was the unforeseen work undertaken by the Clinical Governance Team for the GHA which have required additional funds of £350,000 and £200,000 beyond the £400,000 shown in Head 7 – A, sub-head 4 in the Estimates of Expenditure approved by the House for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answers to Question Nos. 82, 83 and 84**

The pilot initiative for scheduling of Gynaecology is proceeding as outlined in my answer to Question No. 2241 of 2004 and in my letter to the hon Member dated 24 February 2005.

The first stage is the development of new theatre schedules to increase the theatre capacity of Gynaecology. This has already taken place with extra sessions being given for Caesarean sections and Day case procedures. The primary aim of this is to reduce the waiting list, which is an essential prerequisite for a scheduled service. This will be developed further with the recruitment of extra theatre staff in the next few weeks and so bringing about a further increase in theatre sessions for all specialties.

The centralisation of waiting lists has also commenced with the appointment of a waiting list manager who is currently centralising all waiting lists including gynaecology.

Finally, the third component an improved bed management system is now clearly evident with structures and processes developed to improve bed availability and therefore maximising that bed availability.

**Answer to Question 103**

The Healthcare Development Team report on Clinical Services has not yet been received. Recommendations regarding KGV would be part of the Psychiatric Services Section.

**Answer to Question 106**

The pain clinic staffing has recently been enhanced by the addition of a new consultant anaesthetist with extensive experience in pain management. The staff composition of the Pain Clinic is as given in answer to Question 835/2004. The position in relation to the Healthcare Development Team recommendations remains as given in answer to Question 1548/2004.

**Answer to Question 122**

The Clinical Report on Laboratory Services is part of the Clinical Services Report which has not yet been presented to the Government.

**Answer to Question 123**

The situation remains as given in answers to Question Nos. 826, 1589 and 2217 of 2004.

**Answer to Question 128**

The total payments made to date to the NHS Modernisation Agency in respect of the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Programme which the hon Member refers to as the Clinical Governance Audit was £1,431,187.85.

**Answer to Question 135**

The additional funds of £350,000 and £200,000 respectively in Head 7-A Subhead 4 in the Estimates of Expenditure for the Financial Year 2004/2005 were required because the Clinical Governance Team were required to provide additional services including transitional management services.

ORAL

**NO. 136 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government confirm how many nurses there are in post as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005, giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.



**Answer to Question 136 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 107**

St Bernard's Hospital

Ward/ Dept	CN/SR	SN	SEN	EN	Aux N	N Asst
Dudley Toomey	1	8.5		7.5		13
Captain Murchison	2	7		7		10
Rainbow	1	8	1	5	2	
Maternity	1 + (1 ag)	9.5				3.5
A&E	1 + (1 ag)	10.5		9		
Victoria McIntosh	2 + (1 ag)	6		8		11.5
John McIntosh	2	7.5		8		11.5
CCU	2	13		9		
Operating Theatre	1	5	0	1 (3 ODP's)		1
Ophthalmic Dept	1	2	0			0.5
Blood Dept		1.5				
Clinics		1	1	8		
Palliative Care		1				
Infection Control	1					
Cardiac Rehab		1				
Night Duty Senior cover	4					
Nurse Convenor						1

Cont...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 136 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 108**

DIRECTOR OF PATIENT & NURSING SERVICES	1
CLINICAL NURSE MANAGER-Maternity	1
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	1
NURSE LECTURER	1
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	2
STAFF NURSES	16
REGISTERED SICK CHILDREN'S NURSE	5
REGISTERED MENTAL NURSE	4
THEATRE NURSES	2
STAFF MIDWIVES	9
OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONERS	3
ENROLLED NURSES	4

**Answer to Question 136**

DIRECTOR OF PATIENT & NURSING SERVICES	1
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERVICES	1
CLINICAL NURSE MANAGERS	6
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	1
SENIOR NURSE TUTOR	1t
NURSE LECTURER	1
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	2
CHARGE NURSE/NURSING SISTER	28
REGISTERED GENERAL NURSES	102½
STAFF MIDWIVES	11
OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONERS	3
TSSU/CSSD MANAGER	1
TSSU/CSSD TECHNICIANS	5
SENIOR ENROLLED NURSES	5
ENROLLED NURSES	81
NURSING AUXILIARIES	10
NURSING ASSISTANTS	89½

ORAL

**NO. 137 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

How many persons have enrolled for the 2005 intake of the School of Nurses for the two year enrolled nurse course?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 138 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 138 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Who is the external examiner who validates the assessment made by the School of Nursing Examiner when marking the final papers for the enrolled nurse qualification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 and 139 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 139 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

What is the cost per student for the training provided to complete the enrolled nurse qualification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137, 138 and 140 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 140 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Is the enrolled nurse qualification gained in the School of Nursing recognised as a qualification in the European Union?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 to 139 and 141 to 143 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 141 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Did all the persons who applied to join the enrolled nurse training course commencing this year have the minimum qualification required for acceptance and if not, how many did?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 to 140 and 142 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 142 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Have persons commencing enrolled nurse training this year been told whether they will be offered employment by the GHA on successful completion of the course in two year's time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 to 141 and 143 of 2005.



**NO. 143 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

What remuneration is paid to pupil nurses undertaking enrolled nurse training, and student nurses undertaking staff nurse training?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 137 and 141**

A total of 13 candidates have applied for the 2005 intake for the two year enrolled nurse course. Of these nine have the qualifications required.

**Answer to Question No. 138**

The external examiner who validates the assessment made by the examiner of the School of Health Studies when marking the enrolled nurse qualification, is Mrs Stephanie Aitken, Senior Nurse Lecturer at Kingston University.

**Answer to Question No. 139**

The cost per student for the enrolled nurse qualification is £11,070 per student over the two year course, of which £10,962 is in respect of the bursary payments and £108 in respect of the external examiners fees and expenses.

**Answer to Question No. 140**

The enrolled nurse qualification is adapted for local needs and is not a qualification which would be recognised in the European Union.

**Answer to Question No. 142**

As at this date there has not been a 2005 intake and therefore the premise of Question No. 142 does not exist.

**Answer to Question No. 143**

The bursary paid to each of the students is £5,481 per annum and is paid monthly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 137 TO 143 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to the question on the cost, the Minister has said that £108 is the external cost and the balance is the bursary payment, I think he said? So there is no other cost in the training then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are costs but they are borne under the cost structure of the Health Authority. There is a cost in running the School of Nursing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but I have not asked whether they are borne, I am asking what is the cost per person. That is to say, if there is a budget then presumably the cost per person depends on how many people one has got training at any one time. Like in any other institution.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The question has been interpreted on what is the cost of running the course additional to any other existing course. That is why we have not included the pay of the lecturers who are employed anyway, it is all done by locally employed people so the additional costs to GHA are the bursary and the cost of the examination fees. If the hon Member would like a wider answer to the question, I am happy to provide that if he would indicate how wide he wants it costed but maybe he could write to me and give that indication.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the question is absolutely clear. It is the cost per student for the training provided to complete the enrolled nurse qualification and therefore it is the cost for the training provided. The Minister has given me the answer that the figure of £11,000 is predominantly the cost of the bursary which is in fact already covered by Question No. 143 on the remuneration paid to the nurses. That is a different question, one is what the nurses are getting paid and the other is what is the actual cost irrespective of to whom it is charged of providing the local training?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is clear that the answer does not include in-house costs of the GHA because presumably, I am now speculating, but presumably the people that are delivering this

course are also doing other things. They may even be training nurses other than enrolled nurses. It is therefore very difficult to attribute when in-house resources are being used to deliver training, it is actually quite difficult and those people are doing other things as well, it is actually quite difficult to decide what proportion of those internal costs that one has to carry anyway, whether delivering this enrolled nursing training or not, how much is attributed (a) to the enrolled nurse course; and (b) per head. I suppose it is possible to attribute on a notional basis to the enrolled nurses course but it would be in a sense, a deceptive answer in a sense because it would suggest that if the courses were not being delivered that cost would not be incurred and that would not be true. Therefore it is not a cost attached to the training because even if that training was not delivered, the cost would not be avoided the cost would still be incurred by the GHA and therefore query whether it is the cost of delivering the course. Of course there might even be management time involved in delivering in-house training, electricity costs, library, where does one stop at notionally attributing internal costs that are part of the normal operating cost infrastructure to a particular function of the Health Authority, in this case delivering training. It is possible to do it, it is not done on that basis and certainly the answer to the question is not given on that basis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So are the Government saying then that in the budget of the School of Nursing there is not an identifiable amount which is due to the running of courses for enrolled nurses and which would not be there otherwise?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Except these items.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is the position then?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not want the hon Member to leave with any confusion in his mind. I mentioned two figures, £10,962 in answer to Question No. 139 plus £108 in respect of fees. Then in answer to Question No. 143 I mentioned £5,481 but that is a per annum figure. If he multiplies £5,481 by a two year course it comes to £10,962. So all I have given him is the cost of the payments to the students plus the cost of the examination. If the course had not taken place, those costs would not have been incurred.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware of the answer that he has given to me, this is why I pointed out to the Minister that he has given me the same answer to two different questions, except that he has told me what the cost is in two years in answer to Question No. 139 and what the cost is in one year in answer to Question No. 143. I am able to multiply one figure by two to arrive at the other one so clearly what I am trying to establish, which I

think he has confirmed, is that in terms of the budget of the School of Nursing if tomorrow there was no intake of enrolled nurses the budget would remain unchanged. That is the position.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, except for these items. Except for these points.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes but that is not part of the budget of the School of Nursing. These payments are the payments that people live in terms of their salary as it were, as students.

**NO. 144 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CALPE TENANTS ASSOCIATION**

What action do Government envisage they will take pursuant to meetings held with the Minister for the Environment by the Calpe Tenants Association?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

I recently met with the Calpe Tenants Association and received their representations on the continuing problem of apes roaming in this area and foraging for food within the bin enclosure areas. It was explained to the tenants, and they agreed, that to a large extent this problem was due to some residents, albeit a minority, insisting on feeding the apes and it was this that principally attracted them to that area. It is true in addition that the refuse bins provide the apes with a further rich source of food and it is this combination that has resulted in the apes frequenting the site. The Department concerned has been studying the problem for some time and various options have been considered. Two recommendations have been made namely, the first one is to alter the design of the refuse enclosures so as to make it virtually impossible for the apes to enter. This approach has worked in other areas where similar problems have been experienced in the past. The second recommendation is to ensure that there is a stricter enforcement of the law in relation to the feeding of the apes. It is considered that the adoption of these measures will have the desired effect without there being a need to resort to other measures.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 144 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that answer. This weekend in particular was a very bad one, there was a very large amount of mess that anybody driving down from the Upper Rock would have seen. I actually had a conversation with one of the gentlemen from Master Cleaners who was there to clean up, who was pointing out to me that all sorts of home material is strewn all over the place, sanitary towels in the middle of the road, we have tourists in that area, forget the tourists, the people who live there, the children who live there, I want to address the two points to which the hon Gentleman has referred me to which is the question of redesigning first of all the refuse enclosures. I am very grateful for that. That in fact was.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

One has to understand what that involves. That involves the location.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, in fact that is one of the issues which I raised in an earlier question that we should redesign the refuse enclosures so that the apes would not be able to get access to them, as I remember saying in this House has been successful in other estates. I am grateful that that is now being looked at. The one issue that does concern me is the second point, this question of the stricter enforcement of the laws. We were all very pleased to see, I think during the last legislature, that there were amendments to the legislation in order to enable stricter enforcement of the laws against those who were feeding the apes. I can confirm to the Chief Minister that I make sure that I do not feed them from my kitchen at all, although they have been known to wander into my kitchen and feed themselves. It is that bad. Perhaps my kitchen should be redesigned so that nobody can get into it, but the legislation is now in place and was put in place in the last legislature. We saw the commencement of the stricter enforcement and then nothing has happened since. I dare say that if anybody were seen to be feeding the apes, even by a neighbour let alone a police officer, they are likely to have themselves lynched because the problem is getting fairly drastic. So can I please ask the hon Gentleman to press the accelerator on this one because really we are going to find ourselves in a situation where either a child is attacked, or an elderly person falls down and because of the muck on the road they are not going to need to go to the hospital to catch MRSA, they are going to catch it on the streets.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not a question of accelerating, the funds have already been provided prove that that is now going to go ahead. There is an element, one contributing factor to the problem which is not reflected in this answer, and that is the fact of the size of the ape population which continues to grow and I think that ultimately simply putting cages around the central refuse collection point outside the hon Member's windows is not going to resolve the problem, because as the ape population continues to grow and they wander further down into town they will just find other central collection points until they find the central collection point outside my window in Irish Town. So I think we need to tackle, this is a growing issue, it is a growing problem and it has got to be done on three fronts. Law enforcement of the feeding, physically encaging them to discourage them, and even if it does not discourage them from coming to town it will certainly mean that they will not be able to cause the mess of disrupting the rubbish itself, and also I think it is now time to seriously and with a sense of courageous purpose to address the question of the ape population. The hon Member may have seen in the press recently, an initiative that is being pursued to see if some of them can be re-exported from whence it is said they originally came.

ORAL

**NO. 145 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Will the Government state what the cost has been of establishing the website [www.gibraltairquality.gi](http://www.gibraltairquality.gi) which will provide information as to the air quality readings picked up by the Air Quality Monitoring Station?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 146 to 148 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 146 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Will the Government confirm to the House the cost of establishing air quality monitoring stations in compliance with EU obligations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 145 and 147 to 148 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 147 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

What was the cost to the Government of the advice received from expert consultants Netcen in the United Kingdom in respect of the installation of the air quality monitoring stations, and would the Government agree to provide the Opposition with the text of any reports or advice received in writing from Netcen Consultants in the UK, in respect of the installation of the air quality monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 145, 146 and 148 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 148 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

What are the terms of the agreement entered into between Government and the Environmental Agency for the procurement of the equipment and associated infrastructure for the installation of the air quality monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The cost to Government of the Netcen report was £18,600. Government are not in agreement to releasing this report.

The cost of establishing the air quality monitoring stations will be approximately £143,810. I say approximately because there are still some minor costs to be invoiced and that is not the exact cost.

Government have entered into an agreement with the Environmental Agency Limited for the purchase, the installation, commissioning and subsequent operation of the two automatic monitoring stations. This is a three year agreement covering all aspects of the project with the total cost over the three years being £411,150. The cost of the establishment of the website and the running of the same is included in this sum.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 145 TO 148 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister confirm that the £411,000 was for the total period of three years, that is the contract price?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful. That is not inclusive of the hardware, the £143,000?

**HON F VINET:**

Right.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just say that it is a pleasure to be able to ask questions in this House about the running and the cost of installing these monitoring stations and not to have to ask when it is going to happen, so I think that both sides of the House will welcome that. I went on to the Netcen website and saw, the Gibraltar Air Quality website, and saw a lot of the readings which are there which are the expected readings. I did not see readings as to particulate matter although I understand that readings are being taken as to particulate matter in the air. Does the Minister know when those are going to become available because obviously those are the ones that will reveal whether there is the presence of any carcinogens, the PM<sub>10</sub> that we have discussed before in this House, in the areas where air quality is being monitored?

**HON F VINET:**

There are two types of readings taken not just by the two automatic stations but indeed other non-automatic data being collected around the Rock. Some of that data is collated in real time automatically and that is posted on the website as and when it is collected. There are those other data which is collected after a few weeks which is then assessed post collection, and perhaps that is the data the hon Member is referring to.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As I understand it Netcen is receiving the data collected in Gibraltar in its headquarters in Oxfordshire and is then interpreting that data in the way that we see on the website. What is the Environmental Agency's role? Is it the hands-on Gibraltar role of changing the tubes et cetera, managing the monitoring stations themselves and maintenance of the monitoring stations themselves or is that part of the role that Netcen is going to carry out in terms of long-term maintenance of the equipment?

**HON F VINET:**

The Environmental Agency is principally concerned with the physical maintenance although the Agency itself will also, in conjunction with Netcen of the UK, monitor the results. The strict maintenance of the data and the website is carried out by Netcen in the UK.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What about the maintenance of the stations themselves, is that the Environmental Agency?

**HON F VINET:**

There is some work, principally calibration work, carried out by the Agency but always done under the auspices of Netcen.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What then is the cost of Netcen going forward, say for the period of three years that is the period of the Environmental Agency's contract?

**HON F VINET:**

The possibility exists that at some point in the future it will not be necessary to engage the services of a UK, rather outside consultant, because that is procedure that will be assessed locally but that is not the case at present.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are the £18,000 that we have paid Netcen our total cost of Netcen to date or have we got to pay them more for maintaining the website et cetera?

**HON F VINET:**

I am not aware of those details at this present time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that because the contract with Netcen is now with the Environmental Agency, or is it still with the Government?

**HON F VINET:**

The Agency.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it therefore fair to interpret the £411,000 that we are paying the Agency to be inclusive of any costs that Netcen may put up?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes that is the logical deduction.

**NO. 149 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Given the Government's stated commitment to improve air quality in compliance with their legal obligation, what are the Government doing to ensure the quality of air in the area of Winston Churchill Avenue and Devil's Tower Road is monitored in order to determine whether or not the concerns raised in the reports previously made available to the Minister for the Environment are justified?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Government are indeed committed to improving air quality in compliance with their legal obligations. However, we do not know to which "reports" this question refers given that we have no knowledge of any reports which refer specifically to Winston Churchill Avenue and Devil's Tower Road.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 149 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We have had debates in this House, in fact the Chief Minister himself has involved himself in those debates, where we were dealing with the report made available to the Hon Mr Britto whilst he was Minister for the Environment about the likelihood, and I remember we had a debate about that issue, the likelihood that the PM<sub>10</sub> might be exceeded in some areas of Gibraltar, and those areas of Gibraltar were identified as being in the northern area and I think they actually identified by name Devil's Tower Road. I do not have the report with me but we have had debates, as Hansard will reflect, to that effect. Now in fact I can recall that the last time that we had this debate was when we were debating where the air quality monitoring station should be and I was concerned that they were going to be in the south district when in fact the report seemed to indicate that the problems were in the northern areas. In the information that has been made available publicly and which the Minister has referred to today about the air quality monitoring stations, he has also told me that data is being collected in other places in Gibraltar. Can he tell me whether those places in Gibraltar are the places which are referred to in those reports, may be likely to show a higher PM<sub>10</sub> indication than it would be safe?

**HON F VINET:**

If the hon Member accesses the website he will see that the data link is divided into automatic and non-automatic data. Under the latter that data is being collected in a number of various locations around Gibraltar. In relation to the two sites, Devil's Tower Road and Winston Churchill Avenue, Glacis Road for example, King's Lines, Laguna Estate, Devil's Tower Road, Catalan Bay Road and George Don House have these facilities. There are in fact photographs and maps available on the website. Because these are non-automatic readers they are not yet available on the website itself but the data is being collated at present.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that data going to continue to be collected or because it is non-automatic is that going to be a mobile data collection which goes to different places, or are we going to have a reliable continuous source of data in relation to those areas?

**HON F VINET:**

It is envisaged that those sites will remain in place throughout the three year programme.

**NO. 150 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ROCK APES**

Can Government say whether the plan to return excess Rock apes from Gibraltar to Morocco is a project which will proceed and if so on what timescale?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Contact has been made with the Moroccan authorities as part of an EU INTERREG project which is in progress. The request to return Rock apes to Morocco is currently being considered by these authorities and a reply is awaited. Clearly we are not in a position to give a time scale as this matter is still under consideration by the Moroccan authorities.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 150 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the past we have debated in this House, I think before the Minister was here certainly, the policy of the Government in relation to the apes. Is it that the Government are now considering changing the policy from actually culling the apes, or killing them depending on which side of the argument one is on, or to now exporting them if this turns out to be a feasible proposition?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think the hon Member should regard them as alternatives, well should regard them as mutually exclusive alternatives. He also knows that exporting them has always been the Government's preference, he knows that a few years ago we went to considerable expense of chartering an aircraft to fly a contingent of apes to a zoo in Germany or somewhere in that area. So exportation is the preference over culling but the hon Member also knows that zoos are fewer and further between than they used to be around the world and that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find zoos that will take animals in. Therefore if exportation fails to solve the problem then other means of doing it will have to be considered and certainly culling is not excluded by the Government. We will avoid culling if possible and I do not know whether there are other techniques, I do not profess any degree of expertise in this matter, I do not know if birth control techniques are available or not in the animal kingdom, I suppose they are but certainly culling is a last resort but is not excluded as a matter of policy.

**NO. 151 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**UPPER ROCK – FIRE BREAKS**

Can Government state when was the last occasion that the fire-breaks in the Upper Rock Nature Reserve were cleared?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The fire-breaks in the Upper Rock were last cleared in early summer 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 151 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say who was responsible for clearing the fire-breaks early last summer and how much they were paid?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Master Service Ltd were contracted to carry out the clearing of the fire-breaks in the Upper Rock. I am not aware of the cost involved but I can try and find out and let the hon Member know. I could give a guess but I would like to confirm that because it is not something that I have at my fingertips.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how long they were engaged in this exercise? The fire-breaks do not show any sign of them having been cleared let me say.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that there is a specific time of the year when fire-breaks works have to be undertaken. The hon Member is correct it happens prior to the summer months. I think it is probably around the month of June when the work is undertaken but that is done in conjunction with the City Fire Brigade who have an input into the recommendations and the timing of this. It cannot be done at any time of the year because of vegetation growth et cetera.



**NO. 152 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DIVING IN GIBRALTAR WATERS**

Do Government have any plans to regulate diving in Gibraltar waters by:

- (a) Businesses
- (b) Individuals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Government presently have no such plans.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 152 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government aware of the existing state of affairs whereby the diving businesses that are not based in Gibraltar come in through the border, take up the diving sites which have been nurtured and created, the artificial reefs, by the local diving fraternity and that local businesses are unable to deliver the diving service to clients because the posts are taken up by divers that come to Gibraltar from abroad? Are Government aware of that state of affairs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the Government are aware of what they read in the newspapers but no one has asked us, that I am aware of, no one has proposed that the Government formally regulate. The state of affairs that the hon Member describes in his question would not require the regulation of the diving industry. There are already in Gibraltar in place laws that prevent businesses from being carried out in Gibraltar without due registration in various places, the Employment Service, the Social Security Office, the Income Tax Office, and if the hon Member is making the point that there are businesses occupying sites in Gibraltar for diving. In other words, diving tour operators or diving excursion or extreme sport companies, are carrying on business in Gibraltar then there are already a whole range of laws that would disentitle them to do that without going through the process of establishing themselves as a business in Gibraltar. So, I have no personal notice I have read some letters in the Chronicle and indeed I received a letter myself a few days ago when the Mancomunidad de

Municipios put out a press release on a basis that frankly we do not comprehend before the Government had put out a statement correcting that press release, I had in the intervening period been written to by somebody making the same point as is the premise of the hon Member's question, but he was concerned that the Government were going to enter into an agreement to allow this to happen, which the Government statement made clear was not the case. If on the other hand the hon Member is saying that foreign companies are carrying on business in Gibraltar, then there are procedures, rules and laws that they have to comply with, otherwise those laws could and should be enforced against them, as indeed they are enforced against anybody else. Not limited to diving by the way.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly the information which the Opposition have is that not only is this going on on a regular basis but those laws are not being enforced, and that often in fact it is even hotels up the Coast that organise diving trips to Gibraltar, drive in with a large van with the name of such and such diving school or diving business on the actual van through the border, proceed to Camp Bay which is one of the examples which I was given where eight divers get out and proceed to dive in these reefs which I understand are somewhere near Camp Bay, which were cultivated or established by the local diving businesses. When they go there with their own clients they find that these prime diving spots are already taken by foreign businesses. The point is that although I understand what the Chief Minister is saying that there are laws already in place, the point which has been made to us is that those laws are clearly not being enforced because otherwise this would not be happening on such a regular basis. Secondly, in relation to the Mancomunidad point, can the Government confirm, I understand there was a statement put out by the Mancomunidad but I happened to hear myself an interview with the President of the Mancomunidad I think it was by the Cadena Ser perhaps on the day that they brought out the statement, and he certainly seemed to be under the impression that although the Chief Minister says there is no agreement to regulate this that this is an issue which was on the agenda for the next round of talks, whatever that may have been, that is what I heard him say myself on the radio. Can the Government clarify both of these issues? One is why the law is not being enforced and secondly whether this issue will be on the agenda of the talks or not, even though no agreement as such is currently in place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, dealing with the last question first I think the Government statement is pretty clear, self-explanatory and takes no prisoners so I think the hon Member has the answer to his question. The Government have, let us be clear, dealing with his first point, the Government have no policy to exclude from access to our leisure facilities residents of Spain, any more than we expect them to exclude us from their leisure facilities. So any demand for action based on not allowing people from Spain access to our leisure facilities is not going to be accommodated by the Government. That is not the question that I was addressing when he asked his first supplementary which related to businesses coming in and I am therefore drawing the distinction now so that we are clear between individuals coming over, just as he and I might go over to Spain to lie on one of their beaches or go on one of their aqua parks or whatever, and residents of Spain coming to Gibraltar to swim on our beaches or to snorkel

underneath the surface of our territorial waters. If on the other hand a Spanish company were carrying on business in Gibraltar on a commercial basis then there are rules and laws relating to the carrying on of business, commercial activity in Gibraltar which need to be complied with and diving businesses are not exempt from those. That is the distinction that I will make and law enforcement is not a matter for Ministers but certainly to the extent that some of these things are administrative like tax, social security, Employment Regulations, those I will certainly make sure that there is not, I mean there is plenty of non-compliance of those things by businesses in Gibraltar but certainly there is no reason, and it is certainly not Government policy, that Spanish diving companies should be somehow not policed. They are subject to being policed and should be policed in the same way and to the same extent as any other non-resident company doing business in Gibraltar and indeed to the same extent as any Gibraltar company doing business in Gibraltar which may be not complying with the same rules.

That said, if despite all these things there were some on-going difficulty of access to a scarce resource, because of course I have drawn the comparison of us not interfering with their access to our leisure facilities just as we do not expect them to restrict us, but of course that is a bit of a generalisation then there are differences of scale. When a resource is scarce and the demand for access to it is greater than the ability of the resource to satisfy that demand, there may be a case for regulation. Not because they are Spanish or Portuguese or German or French but because there needs to be orderly access to a scarce space-limited facility or amenity in this case. I suppose that if this problem reached the stage where for those reasons of orderly access to a limited amenity it became desirable to convert it into a regulated activity, the Government would have no objection in principle to considering a form of regulation, as it has now done for the Port for example, indeed as we do for financial services and other areas of economic activity which for one reason or another policy makers decide and law makers decide should be a regulated activity. So I am not saying that the Government under any circumstances will not regulate this activity and I hope that my rather lengthy answer has clarified the various dimensions of this sometimes confused public debate.

#### **HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am grateful to the Chief Minister for the answer which he has given but I think the question of the distinction which he rightly draws between businesses and individuals is actually a distinction we draw ourselves in the actual question before the House, that is why we were dividing the question into two. Secondly, the Chief Minister also suggested that it is not the policy of the Government to exclude residents of Spain from our leisure facilities any more than they exclude us. The point we have made here is that the local diving companies have actually made the point to us. That is precisely what is happening, that they are not allowed to do in Spain what Spanish based businesses are doing in Gibraltar, and one of them quoted an incident where they had taken out a marine biologist who was actually Spanish out into some part of Spain and the Civil Guard launch approached them, threatened to arrest the Gibraltarian divers and to confiscate the boat and the diving material and it was only because the Spanish marine biologist pleaded with the Civil Guards not to proceed with the arrest and said *'look I am Spanish as well'* that kind of argument, that actually they were allowed to return to Gibraltar and they were not arrested. I think that is part of the problem, that Spanish diving businesses are doing in Gibraltar waters what Gibraltarian diving businesses cannot do in Spanish waters, and that was part of the concern which has been expressed to the Opposition.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes but there are important facts to clarify even in that supplementary that the hon Member has put. If the hon Member were to say to me 'look, Spanish law discriminates against Gibraltarians, let us discriminate against Spain'. No, that is not what the hon Member is saying. What the hon Member is saying is that the laws of Gibraltar are different to what they are in Spain and that the Spanish law bites on Gibraltarians in a more aggressive manner than Gibraltar law, which is different, bites on Spaniards and others. Of course Spanish law bites to the same extent on Gibraltarians as on anybody else. It is not that we are being discriminated against. If in Spain there are procedures, or restriction, or rules, or licensing requirements, or perhaps absolute prohibitions about doing things then we like everybody else, including Spanish residents in Spain, we all have to comply with the same requirements. We may be less familiar with what those requirements are bureaucratically and in substance and therefore it might be in practice harder for us to sort of duck and dive through all the various hoops and loops than for their own residents who may be familiar. The point is this, in both places the legislature makes the law and establishes the requirements. In both places the law has got to be enforced on a non-discriminatory basis. Therefore if the hon Member says to me 'we cannot do in Spain what Spanish people are able to do here', that is not necessarily the product of discrimination, it may simply be that our legal systems are different, that our laws are different. Our laws provide one thing for everybody in Gibraltar, Spaniards included, and their law provides something different for everybody, Gibraltarians and Spaniards included, so we come back to the same point. We have a system that also does not permit non-resident businesses, well any business, from doing commercial activities in Gibraltar without, I do not know whether it is an activity that requires a trade licence but it certainly requires a number of other things. If it should be as therefore important and necessary for Spanish businesses to comply with those requirements of Gibraltar law as it is for our companies to comply with whatever may be the requirements of Spanish law, of which I am entirely unfamiliar, and therefore it just comes down to the degree of enforcement in both places. The hon Member may simply be saying that the Spaniards enforce their laws aggressively and we do not enforce our laws at all and that might be a problem. That certainly can be looked at but the Government do not see this in terms of reciprocity or keeping people in or keeping people out. The law should be clear, it should be fair, it should be non-discriminatory and it should be enforced by whoever's job it is to enforce it. Certainly it is not something of which the Government approve, and I want to make this perfectly clear to him, that Gibraltarian businesses should be unfairly competed against by businesses not established in Gibraltar and which do not have to incur the same degree of administrative procedure, costs, tax, social insurance et cetera as Gibraltar businesses, whether it is in diving or anything else, have to comply with. So it is a question of whether we can collectively decide that a law should be different. If we ever do decide to go down a regulation system then there would be laws that will regulate and then our laws may become closer to what the laws may be in Spain who presumably regulate these things much more strictly. I certainly know they regulate fishing much more strictly than we do so this might be something else that they regulate. So I hope that this answers the hon Member's questions.

**NO. 153 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHARTER**

When will the Government finalise work on the Environmental Charter they have repeatedly promised?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

I cannot give a precise date on the completion of the Charter but a draft proposal for the formal consultation groups and schedule of events has been devised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 153 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact therefore, the position has not altered from when this question was put to the Minister last year and he did indicate then that he expected that the project would have been completed during the course of the last calendar year. Has there been an obstacle in the way of the development of this Charter?

**HON F VINET:**

No, there has been work undertaken internally within the Department and the Ministry, there has been some informal consultation with certain parties and I can tell the Opposition Member that the formal consultation process will start very shortly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Which are the parties that the Government are recognising as the consultation environmental group parties that they are dealing with? Who are the consultations going out to?

**HON F VINET:**

The parties have not been informed officially and therefore it would be improper to reveal details in this House.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is fascinating because the Minister has just told me that they have already completed the informal consultation process and that they are simply about to commence the formal consultation process, so who pray will the hon Gentleman tell us he has completed his informal consultation with, if they do not yet know that he has done this?

**HON F VINET:**

The informal consultation process I said had taken place with some parties who may or may not form part of the ones taking part in the formal consultation process.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Who have the informal consultation processes involved? We have been told it has happened, I am sure it is no problem.

**HON F VINET:**

Principally there have been informal discussions taking place with GONHS.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No other parties external to the Environmental Ministry?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister expect that the parties that will be formally consulted, although for the reasons that he has just told us he will not tell us yet, are they going to be more than just GONHS or will it simply be GONHS?

**HON F VINET:**

What I can say is that the list is very extensive and it is not just limited to GONHS.

**NO. 154 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

What action are Government taking to ensure that the grit mountain in the area of Cammell Laird is not causing environmental pollution to residents in the area of the south district?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Government are pressing Cammell Laird to remove the accumulation of the remaining grit as soon as possible. The Company is exploring several different avenues for the disposal of this grit and Government are hopeful that the matter will be resolved soon.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 154 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are the Government concerned that the residue which makes up the mountain could be dangerous to the public?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it depends what is meant by 'dangerous to the public'. The existence of any deposit of any substance is worse than there being no deposit of the substance at all.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it an environmental hazard?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, our information is that it was being dealt with in a way that would ensure it would not be an environmental hazard, it was being dampened so that particles would not become airborne. Let me say that much as one very recent new daily publication has tried to pretend that the mountain has disappeared because the hon Member put down this question, I hope the hon Member is at least aware of the fact that this

exercise cannot be mounted and executed in three days and he knows that we have been saying in this House for many, many months that this process of the removal of this mountain, which actually has been very difficult to resolve, because there are very strict European Union rules about the cross-border movement of materials of this sort, the cost of removal of this mountain has been very substantial and certainly, we are engineering systems to ensure that it does not re-accumulate. In other words, having removed the mountain that we do not now start with another mountain which we do not remove until it has reached the same height as this one. In other words, that there has got to be a systematic way for the periodic exportation from Gibraltar of this basically residual product from grit blasting and things of that sort in the ship repair yard and that it has got to be routine. It cannot be something that is allowed to accumulate and we are confident that that is now how it is going to happen. So the answer to the hon Member's question is that we are as satisfied as we can be on the basis of what we have been told by the people concerned, that in fact there has not been any risk to public health but certainly it would have been desirable for the mountain not to have been there in the first place, that is clear.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister has referred to the fact that it is not good to have material of that sort accumulating and I think that we can all agree on that. What material was it, does the Chief Minister or the Minister for the Environment, can they tell us what the composition of that grit mountain was which required the difficult transportation process et cetera?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As far as I am aware it is the residual product of blasting ships to scale down the hulls and the paint and all that and it all becomes sort of composite mixture of many things. There is an element of content in the grit mountain which is covered by EU directives on cross-border movement of materials containing that substance. So it is not that the whole mountain is made of one thing, some of it is covered by this restrictive material.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is right, it is a composite and part of the composite is dangerous to health and it is covered by EU directives because it is dangerous to health. Can the Government tell us whether in fact they have carried out themselves, or through the Environmental Agency, any inspections of the grit mountain, because I know that the Chief Minister has told us that to an extent his reliance is on what he has been told by Cammell Laird?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not said reliant on what we have been told by Cammell Laird, I have said reliant on what we have been told by the people concerned, which he should not interpret to being just Cammell Laird and I want the hon Member to know, I could have arisen to deal with it as a point of order, the hon Member cannot ask me a supplementary, listen to me tell him what I have told him about the extent, if any, to which this is a potential danger to public health and then summarise my answer for



the purposes of effect in a way which is totally different to what he has heard me say. So the words 'this is a serious danger to public health and that can be deduced from the fact that it is covered by a directive' are his words and he may not after today impute those words to me or to the Government.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I had asked the Chief Minister was whether the Government either through the Environmental Agency or themselves had carried out any inspections of the grit mountain or whether they were relying on Cammell Laird. Perhaps I should have said or whether they were relying on the people concerned. So my question stands, have the Government carried out any inspection themselves or through the Environmental Agency and who are the people concerned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The people concerned are the Environmental Agency and Cammell Laird, and my understanding is that the Environmental Agency has been monitoring this thing, it has not just been left to Cammell Laird.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Do the Government have the information that the Environmental Agency has determined from its inspections? Have the Government any reports as to the Environmental Agency's inspections of this grit?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether it has. If the Environmental Agency has submitted specific reports to the Government then the Government have them. If they have done reports but they have not submitted them to the Government then I suppose the Government can get them. The answer to his question is that I do not know.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand because the Chief Minister is not the Minister for the Environment but perhaps the Minister for the Environment has such reports.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This goes back long before the present Minister for the Environment took office and actually is dealt with more in the context of the ship repair yard which comes under the responsibility of the Minister for the Port, who happens not to be in the House which is why I am dealing with this as best I can. Although it is an environmental issue it is actually part of Port activities and therefore covered by....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that. One of the things that the Chief Minister said in his first answer dealing with the substance of the issue was that the cost of moving the grit had been very substantial. Does the Chief Minister know and can he tell the House what the cost actually was, and if he does not know exactly what it was, what it was in the region of and who has been responsible for the payment? Has it been Cammell Laird or have the Government in some way been required to by some legal obligation, or assisted by dint of wanting to get rid of the grit as soon as possible in meeting the cost?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

From memory I think the cost is in the order of £500,000 and it has been paid for by the Government on the grounds that Gibraltar hosts a ship repair yard and it is the Government's responsibility ultimately to dispose of waste generated by, we could sort of impose an environmental levy of some sort on Cammell Laird but in order to procure the removal of the mountain it has been removed at Government expense.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that going to be the situation going forward in respect of the removal of this high pollutant material?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the Government finances the removal of all waste materials from Gibraltar whether it is industrial waste, domestic waste, all waste that is not permanently disposed of in Gibraltar is either disposed of in Gibraltar, if it is for example when we had an incinerator by Government expense, or exported from Gibraltar for disposal by others at Government expense. So in that sense this is not an exception. The plan for dealing with this going forward is wrapped up in the Urban Waste Water Treatment Plant which is in the pipeline because that also will produce a large amount of residue, in that case called fly ash I understand or fly ash slag or something like that. So there will be on-going requirements for the disposal of materials generated by Gibraltar which EU directives somehow impact on the method of handling and disposal. This is the first example on this scale and the Urban Waste Water Treatment Plant when it comes on stream will generate it and solutions are being sought for how most economically to deal with these disposal issues going forward into the future. I cannot tell him what those solutions might be but they are being looked into.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As a final supplementary can I ask the Chief Minister perhaps not in this House but in correspondence to let me know, I am sure that this is not a confidential issue, but to let me know because neither he nor I are scientific men, exactly what part of the composite of this grit mountain was regulated by EU directives and had to be removed in keeping with the obligations set out in that directive?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If he will write to me I will certainly answer his letter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask, is this the first time that the Government have paid for the removal of the grit since the operation started?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I think it is the first time the grit has been removed since the operation started.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and is it that the company was unwilling to remove it at their own expense and that is why it is accumulated?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well let me qualify my answer. Certainly it is the first time it has been removed since the applicable EU directive came into force and therefore it is the first time that removal was an issue. In other words, it could not just be disposed of with the rest of the yard's rubbish.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Which they were not doing anyway. They were not disposing of it with the rest of the yard's rubbish because they were actually mounting it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

How it has been disposed of before the European Union came into force, I could not say to the hon Member. I said this is the first time that grit has ever been removed, that is what I said two minutes ago and I have asked for the opportunity to correct that answer. Certainly it is the first time that it has been removed since that directive came into operation. Yes, Cammell Laird take the view that they cannot afford to remove it and we have looked at their accounts and satisfied ourselves that indeed they could not afford to remove this from the yard. The Government therefore accepted the removal as with all other industrial refuse from Gibraltar.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Did this happen in the last financial year or since the 1<sup>st</sup> April in the current financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether the payments have been made or not yet been made.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So what is it that Cammell Laird organises the removal and then bills the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes that is why I hesitated before to say that it has been removed by the Government and changed that at Government expense because I think that Cammell Laird are doing the practicalities of it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How has the payment been arrived at? Is it on the basis of tonnage of grit or is there a written agreement between Cammell Laird and the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Work like that is a cost. In other words, one has got to find some one to accept it abroad, I am not sure whether this is going to the UK or to Bulgaria or Rumania or somewhere like that. One has got to find a facility that will accept the refuse, they charge for that so there is an element of cost, then one has to transport the stuff to whoever one has contracted with to take it off one's hands and then one has to load the ship here and unload the ship at the other end. So those are the elements of cost. One has got to load the ship, charter the ship, unload the ship and then pay the person at the other end to take it off one's hands. Those are the elements of costs, it is not an agreement between the Government and Cammell Laird, it is basically the Government funding all those arrangements as they have been entered into.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just one final point. The Chief Minister used the word 'ship', is it definitely going by ship or is it being shipped in another way by lorry to Bulgaria or wherever, it is going by vessel?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell the hon Member, when last I saw this matter the proposal was to export it by ship. I have not since heard any different but it is not impossible, I cannot tell him where it is going, who has agreed to take it off. If it is in Spain I suppose it will go by lorry. If it is anywhere else I suppose it will go by ship. I do not know whether the plans that have actually been implemented are the ones that I was last appraised of.

**NO. 155 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES**

Can Government explain the increase in number of 609 in the number of commercial vehicles with current licences as at 31 December 2003 compares to 31 December 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The increase in the figures between 2002 and 2003 is mostly accounted for by an increase in the number of vehicles which were imported into bond and registered as self-drive vehicles and which were subsequently re-exported.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 155 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So how does that compare with the numbers that are shown in Table 69 where the number that have been licensed as new registration is 308 in the year? The figure that I am quoting is from Table 70 of the Abstract of Statistics which is the licences that are current for commercial vehicles and that has gone up from 1,367 to 1,976 which gives us an increase of 609 at the year end. My question is how does that relate to the numbers that were registered during the year which is 318? I have difficulty in reconciling how the number at the end of the year can be more than the numbers at the beginning of the year plus the numbers that were registered during the year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have the tables in front of me. There were a total of 597 in 2003, is that the year that we are looking at?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of the 1,976 commercial registrations, 597 were self-drive vehicles which were re-exported. Now is the hon Member saying that the figures registered at the end of the year, the increase is smaller than that would suggest? I am not following the analysis that he is making.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am saying is that the figures registered at the end of the year exceed the figures registered at the beginning of the year by 609, so that would suggest that if the numbers at the end of the year were still here, if some were registered and then removed and disappeared from the figure one would expect in fact that that would leave a net figure of 609. So the answer that I have been given does not seem to provide the explanation of the 609, but in any case I am asking how is it that in the previous table, Table 69, which gives the registrations that took place during the year, the figure is 318.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The 609 is the amount of the increase not the amount of vehicles registered in total. It is the increase in the amount of vehicles registered. I have not got the table in front of me that the hon Member has got, that is the problem.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is correct, my question is this. Given that the net result of vehicles being registered and vehicles being removed is an increase of 609 in the remaining numbers registered at the end of the year.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Which was 1,976.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Which was 1,976 as opposed to 1,367, how is it then that the numbers of new registrations during the year which by definition ought to be more than 609 since some were removed, was 318? Is it that the 318 is the figure that is incorrect?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the hon Member certain that he is looking at the figure of 318 and that that is the figure for new commercial registrations?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is correct, it is in the column of commercial motor vehicles 318, new added during the year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I would need notice of the question. If the figures are the ones that, and I have only got some of those things in front of me, but if I am telling him which is correct that the number of commercial vehicles has increased by 609, which is the clarification he sought, and yet he is looking at something there which suggests that new registrations, new commercial registrations were only 318, then subject to checking for any other explanation the only logical explanation would be that they were not all new. I cannot think of any other unless there is an error in the statistics.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My understanding of this table published by the Government is that it is not a question of new vehicles but new registrations. Even if it is an old vehicle, if it is newly registered it appears here as a new registration in that year. If it comes from somewhere else with a different number plate when it is converted to a Gibraltar number plate it is a new registration.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I beg his pardon. I had assumed that when he said new he was reading from a column registration of new vehicles.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, new registrations of vehicles.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Then in that case my speculation would not apply. I will have that checked out and give him an answer this afternoon.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The information the Chief Minister provided in the initial answer was that they were vehicles which were imported during the year and re-exported but were registered. Now, would those vehicles appear as new registrations or not? The ones that he mentioned which would not be at the end of the year because they have left before the end of the year but would those be reflected in statistics on new registrations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well on the basis of the information and the explanation that I have been given, the answer would be yes because I am told that they are imported and registered as self-drive vehicles. So it is not that they are just imported, held in bond unregistered and then re-exported, these things are actually registered. So the answer to that question is yes.

-----

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I told the hon Member this morning that I would come back to him on Question No. 155 in relation to the apparent discrepancy between the figure in Table 69 for new registrations of 318 in 2003 and this figure of an increase of 609 in Table 70. The explanation lies, it is just that I did not have the Abstract this morning so I could not see what Tables 69 and 70 actually said. Table 69 is new registrations of vehicles. In other words, log books issued, whereas Table 70 is licences current. That is to say, road taxes paid up. One is the registration of vehicles in the vehicle registration, in other words the log book, not being a driver I do not suppose he knows about log books. One is when one registers one's car when one buys it, in other words registration of ownership of the car, that is Table 69. Table 70 is licences which is road tax discs paid. Now what happens apparently is that people do not always renew their road tax on time, especially in respect of commercial vehicles, some which are laid up, some of which are garaged, some of which are just paid late. Therefore, the figure of 609 road tax increases consists of the 318 of the new vehicles plus the renewals from previous years that had not been renewed on time. In other words, were renewed late in that year and which therefore inflate that year's figures of road tax. So the 318 are included in the 609 but do not account for the 609 because there are things other than new registrations of vehicles in the 609 figure.



ORAL

NO. 156 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**COST OF REPAVING LOBBY**

Can Government give the final cost of repaving the lobby of the House of Assembly?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

The final cost of repaving the lobby of the House of Assembly has been £20,142.90.

ORAL

**NO. 157 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Can Government say whether the section of Irish Town from John Mackintosh Square to the corner of the Police Station has been handed back to the Government by the contractor and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 158 and 159 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 158 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Can Government say on what date was John Mackintosh Square handed back to the Government by the contractor?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 157 and 159 of 2005.

**NO. 159 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Are Government now in a position to say whether any penalties have been applied to the contractor in respect of the John Mackintosh Square beautification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The section of Irish Town from John Mackintosh Square to the corner of the Police Station was handed back to Government by the contractor on 15 April 2005. The Square itself was handed back to Government on the 25 June 2004 when a substantial completion certificate was issued.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the contractor for John Mackintosh Square no penalties are due to be levied against the contractor.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 157 TO 159 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 159, the Minister said that there are no penalties due. I remember raising this issue in the House in the past and there was obviously general consensus that the project had been delayed from what was originally envisaged as the completion date, and that maybe penalties may arise. Can the Minister explain why it is that there have been none?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

These construction contracts provide for two things. They provide for extensions of time, they provide for penalties rather when the contractor takes longer than he is allowed to take under the contract, but they also have clauses that allow for extension of time to the contractor on the happening of certain events which are thought by JCT and the designers of these models not to be the contractor's fault. Therefore when deciding whether liquidated damages are incurred or not it is not just a question of seeing whether the contract has taken longer than it was originally scheduled to take, it is a question of seeing whether it has taken longer than the original period as extended by the correct application of the clause that entitles the contractor to extensions of time. In this particular contract the project manager has assessed that all the delay has been for reasons which do not entitle the Government

to liquidate the damages. In other words, it is for reasons which entitle the contractor to an extension of time. There are various types of things, some of it may be when the client asks them to do extra work or when the client changes the instructions that are given, or inclement weather or force majeure, a list of things and I could not tell him which they are in this case.

ORAL

**NO. 160 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Who is responsible for giving permission for loading and unloading by commercial goods vehicles in John Mackintosh Square and Irish Town while beautification works are in progress?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 161 of 2005.

**NO. 161 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Can Government say what the position is in respect to loading and unloading by commercial goods vehicles in the part of Irish Town adjacent to John Mackintosh Square and in the Square itself?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The works both at John Mackintosh Square and the section of Irish Town from the Square to Cloister Ramp have now been completed. The Department of Transport has never issued permits for loading and unloading in this particular area whilst the beautification works were in progress.

As a consequence of these works, a new unloading bay will be created at Line Wall Road, immediately to the north of the junction of Line Wall Road with Cloister Ramp. This general area will therefore be serviced from either this new bay, or the existing loading bay adjacent to Amar's Bakery as well as from Main Street itself.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 160 AND 161 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister may have noticed if he walks through Irish Town, which I do every day, that it is actually physically impossible now to enter Irish Town from the north because there are these metal pillars that have been placed there and goods vehicles or other vehicles cannot get into the Square. I take his point about the loading bay in Line Wall Road but there used to be one loading bay in that section of Irish Town itself which would service the businesses in that area and there are also several other loading bays in Cloister Ramp itself, which those have now become Police bays. My understanding is that at the moment goods vehicles can only load or unload up to 10.00 o'clock in the morning, and whilst that may be convenient to businesses who receive deliveries and they can actually schedule a time at which to receive the delivery, for example bars and restaurants which may receive deliveries of food which they then sell to clients, there are other businesses in the area and I am speaking for other businesses as well not just the one in which I am involved. Let me declare an interest in that for I am speaking for other businesses as well, who actually not just receive deliveries but also have to make them, which is different. Whereas one can plan when one receives it and can schedule it for 9.00 to 10.00 in the morning it would be fine, one may have to make deliveries at a particular time

and perhaps one is delivering a large piece of equipment. There is no facility at the moment, I understand, for that to happen except to request some kind of emergency pass which they make available for that particular moment and that particular time, if one can get hold of the person that issues them. So I say this in order to ask the Government, which I suppose is my supplementary, whether Government would look at the question of loading and unloading in the Square and in that section of Irish Town again?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government understand that pedestrianisation policies have a cost, a price, some people get a huge benefit and other people pay a price in terms of less convenience, no longer being able to drive one's car to the front door not just one's business, one's home indeed, and that that is inconvenient for the people that it affects. We believe that pedestrianisation is a worthwhile contributor to the quality of life in the centre of our town and that it is worth accepting these inconveniences that go along with it. The loading and unloading bay, and I accept his point that people think of loading bays as it being only for acceptance of deliveries, but whereas the businesses located within and who in itself is a provider, they may have to unload. Of course one can continue to use the loading bay which is just moving round the corner to the Line Wall Road side of the junction between Cloister Ramp and Line Wall Road, that loading bay remains available and I am sure that the hon Member's company and its neighbours will not find it too inconvenient to wheel a barrow up the Cloister Ramp to insert the goods into the back of the van. The only other alternative is really to destroy the whole contractorisation because we would not be willing to do anything there that we were not willing to do in other pedestrianised zones and if every business in the pedestrianised zone is going to be allowed to breach pedestrianisation when it is making outward delivery as opposed to inward acceptances of delivery, the whole pedestrianisation concept I think would be substantially compromised. So we had not thought of this as being an area actually that had too many businesses, obviously we were aware that the hon Member has his party headquarters there and that the Panorama has its offices there, but what I can promise is that we have not pedestrianised for any of those reasons, that I can promise him. There is not a huge amount of commercial activity in that little stretch. The judgement was made that it could be serviced from either Main Street or from Line Wall Road loading bays. Of course, yes, the Panorama is now in Irish Town, further down Irish Town in our ex party offices.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just, because this is a point that was made to me by another of the businesses involved which is also in the Square, that is that there are some types of service industries who actually do not make deliveries but nonetheless seem to have these passes to pass through Irish Town. I do not know whether the telephone company might be a case in point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the only ones that have, to my knowledge, and I have to say the extent to which it is necessary. Let me just answer the question first and then comment on it. I think it is limited to people like the utility providers and the security companies, on the grounds that it is a breach of security to park one's cash delivery vehicle 300



yards up the road and then walk down the road clutching a bag of pound notes or whatever. So I think the security companies have got. The point that I have often made there is whether their use of those passes should be limited to when they are making deliveries in those areas, as opposed to saying 'well, I have got a pass to drive through Irish Town. I will use it on my way to somewhere else that they could have reached by another route. My personal view, although I am not involved in the administration of it, is that people who have passes to exempt them from pedestrianisation should only be allowed to breach the pedestrianisation when their destination is in the pedestrianisation zone and they have no alternative means of access to their destination. That is my personal view but it may not necessarily be how it is working which may explain why he sees vans going up and down perhaps more frequently than they should. Indeed I have noticed that he is speaking only for Irish Town that they do not even respect the direction of traffic. I mean I often see them sort of speeding up Irish Town north to south instead of south to north. I never quite understood why that is necessary, unless it was during the works.

**NO. 162 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**NUMBER OF PARKING TICKETS**

Can Government state how many parking tickets were issued and how many vehicles were clamped in the year 2004, giving a breakdown of locally registered vehicles and foreign registered vehicles for each category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

A total of 15,570 fixed penalty tickets were issued in 2004, of which 14,384 were issued to locally registered vehicles and 1,186 were issued to foreign registered vehicles.

With regard to clamping, 777 were locally registered and 133 were foreign registered making a total of 910.

**NO. 163 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**NUMBER OF PARKING TICKETS**

Can Government state the total amount collected in respect of parking tickets in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004, giving a breakdown of locally registered vehicles and foreign registered vehicles?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

This information is only available at the Magistrates' Court. However, the system is currently pending computerisation and therefore the information is not readily available. Notwithstanding, a manual exercise can provide the information requested, but it would take several weeks to compile it.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 163 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Does the Minister undertake to provide me with this information as soon as it is available?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think the answer is no. I do not think it is appropriate for the Government to dedicate several weeks of administrative effort to compile information which is not readily available. Another thing is that the computerisation may be able to be done in a way that when the information is inputted it can then be extracted and then the information can certainly be provided. But the Magistrates' Court staff do not have sufficient spare capacity and time on their hands to spend several weeks putting this information together.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister then give me an approximate date by which the system will be computerised?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a programme, a Government department computerisation programme and I cannot from memory tell him where this particular part of the department fits into it. I cannot tell him but we can find that out to see if it is programmed for any time soon, or whether it is one of these medium-term things on the wish list. I can find that out.

ORAL

**NO. 164 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in the year 2004, their duration, the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 165 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 165 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in the quarter ended 31 March 2005, their duration, the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The number of power failures that have taken place in the year 2004 and which have affected whole districts have been 20. The number of power failures that have taken place in the quarter ended 31 March 2005 and which have affected whole districts have been 10. As the hon Member can appreciate the statistical information requested in relation to such incidents is extensive and is therefore set out in the written schedules that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 165**  
**Answer to Question 164**

Incident No	Date	Duration	Areas affected	Reason
1	24 1 04 18.40hrs	12 to 15 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,12,14,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS tripped manually. Excessive fuel Leak
2	23 2 04 00.40hrs	19 to 20 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,12,14,17,18	ISGS generator No.14 fault
3	14 3 04 01.38hrs	6 to 13 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set No.1 at WPS tripped manually. Exciter rectifier burnt.
4	7 4 04 12.46hrs	8 to 12 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set No 1 at WPS master trip activated suspected fault over-speed circuit
5	7 4 04	4 mins	Two districts supplied from WPS 11,14	Fault in generator set no 5 at OESCO. Oil pipe leak. Feeders tripped manually.
6	8 4 04 09.55hrs	5 to 10 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Fault in generator set no 5 at OESCO. Overload protection.
7	9 4 04 15.56hrs	6 to 11 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 5 at WPS master trip activated. Heavy fuel leak
8	20 4 04 09.58hrs	6 to 14 mins	Six districts supplied from WPS 10,12,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 1 at WPS master trip activated suspected fault over-speed circuit
9	6 5 04 19.50hrs	7 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	MOD Interconnector tripped due to fault at ISGS Power Station
10	9 5 04 09.08hrs	2hrs 29mins	One district supplied from KBDC 7	HV Feeder cable fault to S28 Governor's Parade substation
11	15 5 04 07.49hrs	4 to 8 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	OESCO no 4 generator tripped due to human error
12	17 5 04 08.15hrs	7 mins	One district supplied from WPS 15	OESCO no 6 generator emergency shutdown. District tripped manually
13	13 7 04 01.17hrs	7 to 12 mins	Six districts supplied from WPS 12,13,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault
14	14 7 04	5 to 8 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault
15	29 7 04 02.07hrs	12 to 17 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	ISGS generator no 14 fault
16	6 9 04 16.18hrs	8 to 14 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 1 generator trip due to electrical fault (failed diode)
17	20 9 04 18.04hrs	5 to 8 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 4 generator trip due to electrical fault (main bearing temp. sensor failed).
18	21 10 04 10.44hrs	3 mins	One district supplied from WPS 18	Feeder tripped following electrical works on the emergency lighting. Under investigation.
19	19 11 04 07.23hrs	7 to 10 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault
20	23 12 04 10.42hrs	5 to 9 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Turbocharger "A" bank breakdown

Contd.....

**Contd Answer to Question 165**  
**Answer to Question 165**

Incident No	Date	Duration	Areas affected	Reason
1	8 1 05 13.15hrs	8 to 10 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Alternator's neutral bars earth fault due to vibrations
2	22 1 05 11.30hrs	18 to 20 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 6 generator tripped on load. Electrical fault.
3	25 1 05 22.24hrs	7 to 9 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 6 generator taken off load by mistake Operator error
4	3 1 05 01.12hrs	9 to 13 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 10,13,15,18	Falling Frequency Protection System tripped feeders as a result of load surge when closing JBDC interconnector
5	3 2 05 03.25hrs	5 to 7 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 10,13,15,18	Falling Frequency protection System tripped feeders as a result of surge when closing S10 Bayside
6	6 3 05 18.21hrs	1hr 24 mins to 1hr 52mins	Eleven districts supplied from KBDC & JBDC 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,19,20	Translay Relays operated at WPS disconnecting the two Interconnectors WPS to OBDC
7	18 3 05 23.55hrs	6 to 20 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 10,13,14,15,18 and oen from KBDC 9	Generator set no 3 at WPS tripped due to faulty exhaust valve link pin
8	19 3 05 23.24hrs	1 to 3hrs	District 2 St Bernard's Hosp restored after 1 min All districts fed from OBDC and JBDC affected by up to 3 hrs	Fault in Interconnector no 1 OBDC – OESCO
9	19 3 05 01.00hrs	4 to 7 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,13,14,15,18	Fault in Interconnector no 1 OBDC – OESCO. FFP activated.
10	19 3 05 01.13hrs	7 to 10 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,13,14,15,18	Fault in Interconnector No 1 OBDC – OESCO. FFP activated



ORAL

**NO. 166 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government provide an update on the situation regarding the re-opening of Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

There is no change since the hon Member last enquired.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 166 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In perusing the Government's Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, under Head 103, can the Government say whether works are likely to start in this financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 167 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state whether outline proposals for the project to enhance the state of the Cemetery have been agreed by the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Various proposals are currently being considered by Government. I can say that the Cemetery will be the subject of a far more extensive address at the Budget session.

ORAL

**NO. 168 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government state what progress has been made with the tender of the Sewage Treatment Plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

A Technical Advisor for this project has now been selected and we are in the final stages of concluding the appointment.

ORAL

**NO. 169 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the dispute involving Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department has now been resolved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The situation remains as in reply to Question Nos. 2095 and 2096 of 2004. The Driving and Vehicle Examiners have submitted a claim which Government continue to consider not to be reasonable or justified and it has therefore not been met.

ORAL

**NO. 170 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state how many paying passengers were transported by GBCL in the financial year 2004/2005, giving a breakdown by level of fare charged and total value collected per level of fare?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 171 of 2005.

**NO. 171 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of employees working for the GBCL as at close of business on the 31 March 2005, their grades and provide a breakdown of the annual salaries paid to these grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedules that I hand over.

The question refers to annual salaries relating to these grades, can I just clarify that the salaries as they appear in the reply are in fact the basic salaries and of course subject to further increases.

**Answer to Question 171**

**Answer to Question 170**

**SUMS COLLECTED IN STERLING**

CLASS	REVENUE	COUNT
Adult Single	£237,399.60	404,182
Adult Return	£153,456.60	171,064
Child Single	£31,029.70	78,047
Child Return	£10,292.20	17,174
Adult Day Pass	£12,390.50	8,243
Child Day Pass	£1,174.40	1,176
Tourist Day Pass	£1,318.50	863
Senior Citizen Single	£44,477.30	148,242
Senior Citizen Return	£28,725.00	57,446
Senior Citizen Day Pass	£2,985.80	3,728
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£523,249.60</b>	<b>890,165</b>

**SUMS COLLECTED IN EUROS**

CLASS	REVENUE	COUNT
Adult Single	£101,987.00	169,001
Adult Return	£98,460.02	107,755
Child Single	£2,743.92	6,602
Child Return	£1,985.07	3,232
Adult Day Pass	£5,777.18	3,772
Child Day Pass	£411.20	414
Tourist Day Pass	£1,329.00	868
Senior Citizen Single	£7,157.59	23,321
Senior Citizen Return	£8,388.50	16,776
Senior Citizen Day Pass	£401.84	499
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£228,641.32</b>	<b>332,240</b>

Cont.....

**Contd Answer to Question 171**

**Answer to Question 171**

**EMPLOYEES OF THE GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY**

<b>Annual salary</b>	<b>Job description</b>
£35,000	Director
£35,000	Director
£20,000	Garage/Supt.
£20,000	Marketing
£15000	Bus/Inspector
£15000	Bus/Inspector
£15000	Bus/Inspector
£14,350	Chargehand/Driver
£14,350	Chargehand/Driver
£14,350	Chargehand/Driver
£13,050	Panel/Beater Painter
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver

Cont.....



**Contd Answer to Question 171**

£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£13,050	Driver
£12,272	Office/Administrator
£12,272	Office/Administrator
£12,324	General/Operative
£8,352	Labourer

Up-dated 6/4/05

ORAL

**NO. 172 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they resurfaced during the quarter ended 31 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 173 and 174 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 173 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they resurfaced during the quarter ended 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 172 and 174 of 2005.

**NO. 174 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they plan to resurface in the course of the financial year 2005/2006, providing a breakdown by quarter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government are currently considering the works programme for the 2005-2006 Financial Year and are therefore unable to provide this information. In any case, the Government do not consider it appropriate to provide details of their road works plan. Individual schemes will be announced as and when they are to be executed.

With regard to the resurfacing works undertaken during the six months up to 31 March 2005, we can inform that as part of the City Centre Beautification projects, paving works were undertaken along Irish Town from John Mackintosh Square up to the junction with Market Lane. Cloister Ramp has also been resurfaced. The sections of road leading down to Catalan Bay Village from Sir Herbert Miles Road has also been resurfaced as part of the second phase of the Catalan Bay beautification works.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 172 TO 174 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I propose to take up issue with Question No. 174 at the Budget session.

ORAL

**NO. 175 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government state the latest date by which they propose to fill the five vacancies at Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The interviews for the vacancies have been held and the recommendations are being considered.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 175 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I think the Question asks for the latest date by which they would be filled. Can the Minister provide this?

**HON F VINET:**

I cannot give a definite date, it will happen once the recommendations are considered.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is this likely to be in the short, medium or long term?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know at what stage of the recruitment process, or the consideration process, or indeed where this matter lies, but given that it is recruitment of vacancies that have been advertised it has to be imminent. I cannot tell exactly if it is this week or next week or the week after but that sort of timescale.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Thank you very much. So the vacancies will be filled and a decision will be taken imminently.

ORAL

**NO. 176 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WEIGHT EXEMPTIONS**

Can Government state the number of times that weight exemptions for Europa Road were granted up to a weight of 16 tonnes, on material and plant that cannot be reduced in size or in weight and for ready-mixed concrete wagons, under Police escort in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 177 of 2005.

**NO. 177 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WEIGHT EXEMPTIONS**

Can Government state the number of times that Old Naval Hospital Road was used up to a permitted weight of 20 tonnes by ready-mixed concrete wagons to access the South District in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 and also explain how they ensure that the maximum weight limit is adhered to?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Department of Transport was only tasked with the issuing of such permits as from 2003, with this function having previously been undertaken by the Royal Gibraltar Police. Consequently, I am at present only able to provide the hon Member with such information for 2003 and 2004. The Government nevertheless remain willing to provide to the Opposition the outstanding information as soon as this is received from the Police who are presently compiling the data from their records. I should say, I am actually reading from a prepared reply, I am told the information might have arrived this afternoon at my office, in which case I will forward the same to the hon Member later this afternoon.

In 2003, four daily permits were issued for Europa Road and four daily permits for Old Naval Hospital Road.

In 2004, eight daily permits were issued for Europa Road and three daily permits for Old Naval Hospital Road.

Daily permits are issued for particular operations and this covers any number of vehicle movements on that specific day.

The enforcement of the conditions of the permit is undertaken by the Royal Gibraltar Police who also escort the individual vehicles to their destination.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 176 AND 177 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Could the Minister make clear that when he says three days it could mean three times, 200 days, 600 such trips or have I got that wrong?



**HON F VINET:**

No, the permits apply to each date. For example, in 2003 four daily permits issued for Europa Road but the holder of that permit can actually use the permit as many number of times as it is required during that particular day.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can he then provide me with the figure which I need, which is how many times was the road used by a cement wagon in a calendar year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe that it is impossible to tell because although some permits are issued for a trip, for example somebody says they need to get this lorry up to deliver this piece of equipment to this, that is one trip. When there is a building site for example, a contractor might get a permit for a whole day and I do not think any record is kept of how many times during that one day the permit is exercised.

ORAL

**NO. 178 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the percentage share of the electricity supplied to customers that was purchased from OESCO and MOD respectively in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 179 to 182 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 179 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state how many units of electricity were purchased from OESCO in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 178 and 180 to 182 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 180 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units of electricity they propose to purchase from OESCO in the financial year 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 178, 179, 181 and 182 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 181 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state how many units of electricity were purchased from MOD in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 178 to 180 and 182 of 2005.

**NO. 182 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units of electricity they propose to purchase from MOD in the financial year 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The total number of units purchased from MOD and OESCO during the financial year 2004/2005 was 3,875,432 which equates to 2.7 per cent, and 63,060,940 equating to 44.7 per cent respectively.

We are not at present in a position to provide the hon Member with information on the units of electricity we are likely to be purchasing from either OESCO or the MOD in the financial year 2005/2006.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 178 TO 182 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Again I will take the issue of those questions up at Budget time.

ORAL

**NO. 183 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SALE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the amount of revenue raised from the sale of electricity in the financial year 2004/2005 and the amount billed in the same year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 184 and 185 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 184 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the total number of electrical units distributed in the financial year 2004/2005 and provide a breakdown by Lighting, Power, Domestic, Commercial, KVAs and Special?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 183 and 185 of 2005.



**NO. 185 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the amount of revenue raised by the distribution of electricity in the financial year 2004/2005 and provide a breakdown by Lighting, Power, Domestic, Commercial, KVAs and Special?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The total revenue collected from the sale of electricity during the financial year 2004/2005 was £12,061,030.71. The amount billed during the same period amounted to £12,381,199.

The total number of electrical units and corresponding revenue raised in respect of each tariff during the financial year 2004/2005 is contained in the table that I forward to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 185**

<b>Tariff No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>KWH (Units) Billed 4/2005</b>	<b>Amount £ Billed 4/2005</b>
T1	Lighting	498,022	65,750
T2	Power	329,996	38,927
T3	Domestic	51,300,308	5,081,388
T4	Commercial	66,206,735	5,950,689
T5	Industrial Maximum Demand (KVA's)	14,073,966	1,169,231
T6A	Off Peak (Special)	207,090	14,794
T6B	Off Peak (Special)	823,208	60,420

**NO. 186 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELECTRICITY AND WATER COSTS**

Can Government state how they have calculated the average electricity and water consumption for a family of four?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The method used by Utility companies to calculate an average consumer is to divide the total number of units billed by the population serviced, thus producing a per capita figure. The calculated figure is then simply multiplied by four to determine what the average consumption would be for such a family size.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 186 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So they have taken the whole of the sale to residential premises and divided it what by the population to arrive at a figure per capita?

**HON F VINET:**

That is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Is that the methodology that has been used anywhere else to calculate the consumption of a family of four, to the Minister's knowledge?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is the methodology that both the Electricity Department and AquaGib have separately used, say they have always used and say is the usual methodology. What I can tell the hon Member as a matter of interest is that when they put up these figures as to what was the consumption for a family of four, I personally went to the trouble of checking with a couple of families of four that I know and actually it was remarkably accurate. Now of course it all depends on personal lifestyle, there are

people who consume more electricity than others depending on personal lifestyle issues. It is not scientific but it certainly works statistically and when I have put those statistics to test by a member of staff in the office and somebody else outside, 'can I see your electricity and water bills?' and it is remarkably accurate. Now there will be people with a family of four who pay less than the average and there will be people that pay more.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But that is true of all averages, I just find it peculiar that for example on the basis of that system of calculation it would mean that households of four would pay four times what households of one would pay, well that is how it is being done is it not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it does not follow.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So in practice it would be less for a family of four.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Absolutely, yes. It just seems a peculiar way of doing it precisely because there is an in-built error into a system that it pre-supposes that the size of the family is a multiple of the consumption of a single person household, and that cannot possibly be accurate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, that is how it is done. No one pretends that it is scientific, nobody pretends that it provides an exact response but the margin of error, the structural error is for the benefit of the consumer because in effect it would mean that they would be less impacted by the increase because they do not have four times the base per consumer cost. If one is running a water heater for a family of one, it is still one water heater for a family of four, the cost is not times four. So if we are saying the impact of these rises for a family of four is 'x', it may actually be less than 'x' because in-built into that multiplication is a factor that will not actually materialise in practice. In other words, the cost is not four times as much for four people as it is for one person.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say what is the population figure that was used to divide to produce the unit costs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him but I can say that there are detailed calculations which I have seen, both for electricity and for water, and which are in a file in my office somewhere which provide this information. I am just wondering whether I think some of the information may be available to the hon Members when they get the answer to the questions asked by the Hon Mr Randall on the yields implications. I can certainly let the hon Member know what is the working assumptions of population size and things like that for both electricity and water, I suppose they are the same.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well presumably they are the same unless there are people who have not got piped water supply but have electricity, yes. But would the Minister not agree that in fact the accuracy of that divisor is important in establishing how reliable the four times the figure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course.

**NO. 187 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

What steps have the Government taken since their last answer in this House to ensure that the works aboard the vessel Rotterdam are carried out in a manner that is safe and in keeping with the Factories Ordinance and the Asbestos at Work Regulations and that any asbestos removed from the vessel is disposed of or treated safely?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Since the last related answer in this House on this question, I think it was Question No. 2246 of 2004, the Health and Safety Inspectorate has continued its inspections and monitoring of the asbestos removal works aboard the vessel Rotterdam.

During this time, that is from December 2004 to date, three inspections have been conducted, on 9<sup>th</sup> February, 16<sup>th</sup> March and 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005.

The Health and Safety Inspectorate has accordingly been able to continue ensuring that the asbestos removal works and the storage of this asbestos have been undertaken in compliance with the relevant legislation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 187 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are in fact these works on-going? Is the Minister aware whether the works are on-going or is the Rotterdam now a project that is not going anywhere?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well, for the hon Member's comfort and my own comfort to be honest, the removal works concluded on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 and the asbestos which has been removed is now stored, as I say according to regulations, aboard the vessel until such time as it returns to its port of origin in Holland where the asbestos will be disposed of in some way or another.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

A new dimension emerges. When we have been talking about removal works for much of my questioning in relation to this issue I always assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that the asbestos was being removed from the vessel. In fact it is being removed from where it was on the vessel and stored on the vessel. It is not actually coming on shore or it is not being brought on shore for storage and disposal, it is remaining in the vessel is that right? No asbestos is being brought on shore from the vessel.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is my understanding and it is implied in the way that I have answered the question, my department have answered the question that the asbestos bits and pieces have now been stored within the vessel and will be taken away, thank God.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that once this work is completed on the ship of removing the asbestos, is that the end of the work and the vessel goes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The vessel is undergoing a complete refit of which the asbestos removal is just one part.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the asbestos is being taken off at this stage rather than towards the end of the work, why, is that because they cannot sort of leave it there until they finish all the other things?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know the logistics of the operations there but what I do know is that the work on the asbestos area has now been completed and the asbestos is within the vessel until the vessel is ready, after all the other works that the Chief Minister has just mentioned, and it goes away.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes exactly, my understanding, which I am almost certain is correct from things that I have been told in the past about this vessel, is that the asbestos is staying on board and sailing away with the vessel when the refit is finished which I think is the point that the hon Member was just making.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I appreciate that was the original answer, what I am asking is if the removal of the asbestos is something ancillary to what is being done, why do we need to have the asbestos taken at the beginning and have it sitting there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member appears to believe that the asbestos is cargo or something on the vessel. The asbestos is found in all the things that they rip off to refit. So for example, if this was the ship's ballroom or the ship's dining room and they were refitting it, there may be asbestos in the panels so when they talk about removing asbestos they mean removing lagging and pipes, it is part of the junk that is generated when one strips things away that one is replacing as part of the refit.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I know that the Government do not answer for Cammell Laird but just from the point of view of trying to elicit as much information as possible for the sake of public peace of mind, are the works as far as the Government are aware on-going for the refit of this vessel, or is there any truth to remarks that have come to the Opposition's attention that in fact the refit is no longer going ahead, the company that commissioned it having been put into the Dutch equivalent of liquidation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not accept the premise of the hon Member's supplementary which I think is false. There is no aspect of what the work being done on the Rotterdam that gives any cause for concern for people and therefore to premise his question by saying 'in order to put peoples' minds at rest', peoples' minds need not be other than at rest however long the ship because the work is being done safely. Now that said, the longer it is here with work being done the better because it is providing employment and economic activity in the yard whilst that is happening. I have to say I have recently had meetings with the directors of Cammell Laird on other things and they have not indicated to me what he claims to have heard, and that is that their client has gone belly up or the Dutch equivalent, we have not heard that. It would be a pity if it is the case because this is a valuable piece of work and the value of this sort of work for a yard like Cammell Laird is that it provides greater degrees of stability of employment because it is a long-term contract, which means that it irons out volatility whereas otherwise it is just ships coming and going and there is a lot of idle time to staff, casual workers then get sent home, whereas the availability of this sort of work on the yard has the advantage of providing a greater degree of stability. It would be a great pity if what the hon Member appears to have heard were to be true.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have to say, although obviously the Chief Minister does not share the premise of my question, I think that his Minister and I certainly share certain concerns about at least the asbestos aspects of this work which we are both happy to have seen resolved in a manner that is not going to see the asbestos brought on shore, but I will leave it at that.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Asbestos is only dangerous if not handled or not handled properly. People sort of demonise this substance, there are many more dangerous substances around than asbestos. It is dangerous if disturbed and ignored or dismantled and not properly handled. Properly handled by specialist asbestos contractors, as the Government engage when we do work or discover asbestos, there is no danger for anybody not even for the work force actually doing the handling and the removal of the asbestos. So why the hon Member feels quite so threatened, asbestos is one of these words like the other one, the big 'c' word. It is not dangerous when properly handled.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not as cool a customer as the Chief Minister.

**NO. 188 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NEW ENTRANTS**

In what industry are the two Moroccan national 'new entrants' to the local labour market registered for the month of March 2005?

Perhaps this is a good place to inform the House that the statistic to which I am referring is elicited in respect of statistics provided by the Minister for Employment in writing to me under an arrangement which I think is probably more appropriate if he explains to the House.

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

In those statistics which I provided there was another table on work permits and there we can find the information on these two Moroccans, new entrants through work permits in the labour market registered in the month of March. One is in sales and the other is engaged in personal services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 188 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister has not taken up my invitation to explain to the House the arrangements. I do not know whether he wants to do that or whether I should myself?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes well I simply repeat what the hon Member has said. We made an arrangement to provide written information on these matters of statistics which normally come here orally before the House and which I think is better dealt with outside the House in written communications so that then we can follow up with questions in this House.

ORAL

**NO. 189 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NEW ENTRANTS**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians employed in the months from January to March 2005 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is now provided in a schedule.

**Answer to Question 189/2005**

Number of Gibraltarians who were employed in the months of January to March 2005, who were new entrants to the local labour market:

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>January 2005</b>	11	10	21
<b>February 2005</b>	14	23	37
<b>March 2005</b>	8	9	17

**NO. 190 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATION (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Do the statistics for March 2005 provided in answer to Opposition questions in respect of fixed penalty notices imposed under the Employment Regulation (Offences) Ordinance include fixed penalties imposed on the MOD after inspections carried out at its installations at The Tower?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The simple answer is no.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 190 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister in that case tell the House how many fixed penalty notices were imposed on the MOD when inspections were carried out at its installations at the Tower after the end of March?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Let us get some points of fact clear. The inspection carried out on the MOD took place not at its installations at The Tower but actually in North Front and it took place in April not March, so therefore the statistics for March do not include any reference to fixed penalty notices in MOD. There was an inspection, as I say, carried out in April in North Front and the question related to the findings of that inspection, the question of the possibility of any fixed penalties, is being considered at present.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister will correct me if I am wrong and it appears from his answer that that may be the case, but I recall that press reports at the time indicated that certain irregularities had been found in the way that the MOD was carrying out its employment of sub-contracting activity. I believe the reference was to 'had led' but then one cannot believe everything one reads in the papers, or might lead I thought as a result of the Minister's answer now, to fixed penalty notices. Is that the case,

has there been another instance with which perhaps I am confusing this instance where a fixed penalty notice has been imposed on the MOD?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, there was only one incident of a worker, not as reported, the media rather got things wrong. It was a detached worker and therefore under the responsibility of the local employer, MOD, to have that employee registered accordingly. As I say non-registration is liable to a fixed penalty and this is being considered.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us who it is that is considering whether or not to impose that penalty?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It has been referred to the Attorney General and generally, collectively considered by Government.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it habitually the Attorney General that determines whether or not fixed penalties should be imposed or is it on the spot the inspector who decides, much like a traffic warden makes a decision to impose a fixed penalty and then if the employer or the driver wants to challenge that, he challenges that judicially?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No it is not generally referred to the Attorney General, it is the inspector who determines whether or not but because there are complications here in terms of a detached worker working for a firm which is sub-contracted by the MOD, we felt it is wiser to actually consider the legal implications.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister then telling this House that if there is an infraction of the law, if the Attorney General advises that in fact the law was broken, then there will be a fixed penalty?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just before answering that say to the hon Member that the comparison with the traffic warden is not quite the same. The traffic warden walks around, sees a car parked on a double yellow line and there and then slaps on a ticket. The Employment legislation is not enforced on that basis. They normally go back to their office, consider the facts, in other words, fixed penalty notices under the Employment Ordinance are not slapped in the shock there and then when discovered, unlike a

traffic warden. The answer is subject to (a) legal advice – there are considerations about whether the Crown is subject to a fixed penalty notice. There are all sorts of legal considerations of that sort. If nevertheless, all the legal advice right down the line were that there has been an infringement, then the position of the Government is that the MOD should be dealt with like any other employer. That is to say that whatever degree of first warning is given to all employers should not be denied to the MOD just because they are the MOD. On the other hand, if in the circumstances of this case it would not be the practice to give a first warning to a private sector employer, then nor should a first warning be given to the MOD. In other words, the MOD should be treated the same as everybody else provided the law permits it, no worse and no better.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Of course it is the Crown that is considering these issues and the Crown that may be subject to it, is it that the MOD, because of course the Crown is divisible, is it that the MOD is making representations in its defence or is it simply that the Government are taking advice themselves as to whether there is in fact an infringement, and then will determine how to act given the other considerations that the Chief Minister has put to the House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the MOD has not made any representations as to whether the legislation should or should not be enforced against it. I understand that as a matter of internal business of its own, that the MOD was surprised that our inspectors were able to gain access quite so easily on to their estate but they are not exempt from the law, their estate is not exempt from the law but that is not making representations about whether the Government or the Employment Service should or should not issue.

ORAL

**NO. 191 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the months of January to March 2005 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.



**Answer to Question No. 191 of 2005**

January 2005	Bahamian		Brazilian		American		Israeli		Indian		Japanese		Romanian		Russian		Serbian		Turkish	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.									2						1			1		
Prof.		1																		
Ass. Prof						1														
Admin																				
Skilled						1														
Personal Svs																				
Sales											1									
Plant							1													
Element																				

February 2005	Indian		Polish		Turkish	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.						
Prof.		1	1			
Ass. Prof						
Admin						
Skilled						
Personal Svs						
Sales					1	
Plant						
Element						

March	USA		Bulgarian		Canadian		Hungarian		Indian		Israeli		Polish		Romanian		Turkish		Moroccan	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.	1																			
Prof.																				
Ass. Prof			1						1											
Admin							1		1											
Skilled																				
Personal Svs	1					2					1									
Sales																1				
Plant																			1	
Element																				

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 191 OF 2005**

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is on the table on work permits issued.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes that is it. I think that we have had confusion because the question has been answered under a different heading and under a different question. The question that has been answered is 'can Government state the number of work permits issued in the months since the last answer, giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?', which is a general question. This one is confined to non-EU nationals so I think we need to square those two answers but I am obliged to the Minister.

**NO. 192 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYED GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the months of January to March 2005 receiving :

- a) Unemployment Benefit;
- b) Social Assistance;
- c) no payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The information relates to another Ministry but the statistical information he seeks is now provided in the schedule which I hand over.

**A. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT**

<b>2005</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>January</b>	37	33	70	19	51
<b>February</b>	33	28	61	17	44
<b>March</b>	38	37	75	18	57

**B. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

<b>2005</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>January</b>	88	50	138	31	107
<b>February</b>	82	55	137	25	112
<b>March</b>	86	57	143	29	114

**C. NO PAYMENTS**

<b>2005</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>January</b>	48	47	95	40	55
<b>February</b>	60	31	91	31	60
<b>March</b>	59	17	76	23	53

ORAL

**NO. 193 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state when they expect to be able to provide the Employment Survey Report for October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

We have referred this question to the Statistics Office which produces the Employment Survey Report, and they have assured us that the October 2004 Employment Survey Report will be laid before the House during this current meeting.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 193 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If there is any delay would the Minister be in a position to provide it when we come to debating the Estimates so that at least if we are going to be quoting figures both sides have the same figures available.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will try my best to ensure that.

**NO. 194 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state what works are currently being carried out in Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

We are constructing a much needed toilet block which also includes a store and a changing room for the cleaners and for the lunch supervisors.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 194 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this to cater for the large roll of children that Bishop Fitzgerald currently has?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well, it is related to it in that we were short of toilets, this has been discussed in the House before, for the complement of pupils in the school and this has been now remedied with the construction of the toilets.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Although it is the subject that I have put the question to but is it not a bit short-sighted to have engaged in these extra costs to this school which will later on not be necessary in the sense that there will be another school built nearby in order to decrease the volume of that school itself?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, it is not short-sighted at all. This was an urgent matter, if we had not built the toilet blocks we would be getting stick for not having built them, necessary toilet blocks and the future school in the Mid-Town Project is still ahead and therefore, this was very necessary as the hon Member knows because he has asked questions about it before.

ORAL

**NO. 195 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state what was the total cost of the annexed building in St Paul’s School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 196 to 199 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 196 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government confirm that the standard of construction of the newly built annex at St Paul’s School is adequate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 195 and 197 to 199 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 197 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state what instructions have been given to the head teacher of St Paul's in relation to the newly constructed annex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 195, 197 and 198 to 199 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 198 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government confirm whether their Support Services Department supervised the construction of the building at St Paul's School at any stage?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 195 to 197 and 199 of 2005.

**NO. 199 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how many times the Government safety inspectors assessed the newly built annex at St Paul’s during the construction period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The total cost of the St Paul’s School annex is £1,321,386.01. The expenditure was incurred over a span of two financial years, 2004/2005, the total expenditure was £958,346.55, and 2003/2004 the previous year the cost was £363,039.46. In other words a total of £1,321,386.01.

The Government can confirm that the standard of construction of the newly built annex at St Paul’s School is excellent and much more than adequate. The Government have not issued any specific instructions to the Head teacher of St Paul’s First School in relation to the newly constructed annex, apart from asking her and encouraging her to make full use of the excellent facilities which have been provided.

Technical Support Department did not supervise the construction of the new building at St Paul’s School at any stage. GJBS commissioned a private firm, Andrews, Kent and Stone, to design the building because the TSD could not prepare the drawings within the time span requested, and Andrews, Kent and Stone thereby supervised the works all along on behalf of the constructors GJBS.

The Government Health and Safety Inspector visited the school annex three times whilst construction was under way.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 195 TO 199 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister confirm that there have been problems with the roof of the annex?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There were snagging problems, as usual in every construction, not quite the roof as the hon Member suggests, I think it was one of the tiles in the false ceiling that came unstuck and was stuck back again.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Did that affect the running of the school as in they were using it and then suddenly they were told not to use it for safety reasons?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not to my knowledge. I am not sure of the details but it may have been that while the tile had fallen the children were stopped from crossing that area, but I am not sure exactly what measures, Head teachers and teachers are responsible to know exactly what appropriate measures were taken in that situation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Will the Minister confirm how long this problem to put right will take or is it already completed?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I can confirm that the solution to the problem has been completed.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So there is no longer any building works being carried out at St Paul's at this moment in time?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I cannot give him details, there may be other minor adjustments as I say as part of the snagging problem but certainly with regard to the specific issue of the ceiling of the roof, I can tell him that to my knowledge that has been solved.

**NO. 200 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state at what stage the Department of Education's written policy on Health and Safety is at present?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Following an extensive period may I say of consultation involving all the schools and the College and the Union, the NASWUT, the Department has now requested, rightly I think, the experts of the Technical Services Department and the Government Health and Safety Inspectorate to comment, to make an input into this draft document which the Department has produced, therefore we are waiting for their recommendations as experts before the draft is finalised and the policy document may now be submitted before the Government for final approval.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 200 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The last time I asked the question the answer was exactly the same, that they were doing a consultation process. Can the Minister say how long that consultation process will take?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

If I recall, the answer was not the same, I had no reference then to the fact that the Technical Services Department and the Health and Safety Inspectorate should make an input as experts into this document, and that is exactly the process which is going on at the moment. There is no intended delay if that is the insinuation, providing guidance and proper instruments for the schools on health and safety. We are also quite conscious and conscientious about health and safety in the schools, it is just a question of doing things properly. There is always this urge on the part of the hon Member to rush things and demand datelines and all that. Well, I have told him before on things like this I am not going to be rushed.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am not rushing, he has been in Government for eight years nearly, let us carry on there is no rush whatsoever. As an intended delay, I never said there was intended delay, the delay is already there. The Minister has been in Government eight years and nothing has happened. What I am saying is, how long will this consultation period take? How many times has the Minister consulted the NASWUT? How many meetings have the Department of Education had with the NASWUT in relation to the health and safety issue policy? How many times have the Department of Education consulted with the NASWUT in relation to the health and safety policy?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know how many times, I know they do consult as necessary and conscientiously and wisely.

**NO. 201 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ASBESTOS**

Can Government state how many inspections have taken place in the year 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 to identify whether there is any asbestos in school buildings by the Government's Health and Safety Officers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Two inspections have taken place to identify whether there was any asbestos in school buildings. Bishop Fitzgerald School was inspected in the year 2003/2004 and St Joseph's Middle School during 2004/2005. In both cases the inspection was carried out in response to requests from contractors when the presence of asbestos was being suspected.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 201 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister has stated that there have been two inspections, I presume one of them was in Bishop Fitzgerald and the other one was the St Joseph's one which he has just mentioned. Have any other schools, because I have mentioned all schools, in school buildings in general, all Government schools, have any other Government school apart from these two been inspected by the Health and Safety Inspectors?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, the inspections are carried out when there is a likelihood or a suspicion that asbestos may be present in one of the schools. The hon Member will probably note that the two schools I have mentioned are old military constructions and therefore it was indicative that there might be asbestos. Other schools are of later construction and there is absolutely no likelihood that they have any asbestos in that structure.

ORAL

**NO. 202 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in schools in the last financial year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 203 to 205 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 203 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in the Department of Education in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 202 and 204 to 205 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 204 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in Bleak House in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 202, 203 and 205 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 205 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in the Gibraltar College of Further Education in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information is provided in the attached.

**Answer to Question 205 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 202**

The total expenditure for computers in schools during 2004/05 was £58,651.95 and the breakdown is as follows:

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Bishop Fitzgerald Middle	£8,650.00
St Paul's First	£4,035.50
Bayside	£11,714.75
Sacred Heart Middle	£1,960.00
St Mary's First	£192.00
St Anne's Middle	£2,679.00
St Joseph's Middle	£13,322.70
Governor's Meadow First	£2,796.00
St Bernard's First	£2,000.00
Westside	£11,302.00

**Answer to Question 203**

The expenditure for computers for the Main Office of the Education & Training Department was £590.

**Answer to Question 204**

£1,340 was the expenditure incurred during 2004/05 in respect of computers for Bleak House.

**Answer to Question 205**

The expenditure for computers for the Gibraltar College of Further Education during 2004/05 was £14,260.

ORAL

**NO. 206 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in schools in the last financial year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 207 and 208 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 207 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in the Gibraltar College of Further Education in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 206 and 208 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 208 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in Bleak House in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information is passed on to the hon Member in a schedule.

**Answer to Question 208 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 206**

The total expenditure for maintenance in schools for 2004/05 is £379,821.85.  
The breakdown is as follows:-

SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Bayside	£29,162.22
Westside	£27,170.91
St Joseph's Middle	£37,420.73
Sacred Heart Middle	£10,421.50
St Anne's Middle	£22,078.28
Bishop Fitzgerald Middle	£82,643.03
Hebrew	£1,526.00
St Martin's Special	£94,031.02
St Mary's First	£7,587.77
St Bernard's First	£7,116.02
St Joseph's First	£14,376.22
Notre Dame First	£18,005.26
St Paul's First	£9,706.95
Governor's Meadow	£18,575.94

**Answer to Question 207**

The amount of £16,396.52 was spent on maintenance at the Gibraltar College of Further Education during 2004/05.

**Answer to Question 208**

The amount of £1,456.50 was spent on maintenance at Bleak House during 2004/05.



**NO. 209 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CATERING COURSES**

Can Government state whether any changes have been made to Catering Courses at Bleak House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Catering courses have in the past been delivered at Bleak House Training Institute as modular components pertaining to the School of Tourism Course. These modules were accredited by City and Guilds International and were set as a Level 1 qualification and certificates of unit credits were awarded.

There have been changes. The present trainees enrolled in the School of Tourism courses now follow a Level 2 BTEC first certificate, which as the hon Member may know is the equivalent of a GCSE, in travel and tourism. This Level 2 course prepares trainees towards an administrative role as well as a catering skill within travel and tourism related topics, and the changes have been brought about based upon the advice that we have been receiving from prospective employers in Gibraltar's tourism industry and the travel market.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 209 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So that means that the industry must be satisfied for these students for later on to get employment, must be satisfied with Level 2. Are they satisfied that if they reach Level 2 they are more employable, let us put it that way, into the industry than ... Put it this way, do they accept Level 2 as a way in which they can employ candidates?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, well I think that is implied in what I have just said, that we have acted on the advice of the industry and thereby obviously implying that they think that by training our students to Level 2, their chances and their skills in that area have been enhanced.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do the Government envisage if there is more prospect of them doing Level 3 and maybe going on? As in, for example, a student might get to Level 2 but has not got employment and wants to carry on studying or doing these modular courses onto Level 3, is there any prospect of the Bleak House doing these courses?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There is no provision at present for these courses to reach Level 3, but certainly the door is open for further improvements and we continually monitor the success or otherwise of our training courses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has any course that was previously being run been discontinued?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not quite discontinued, I think the previous courses which were more focussed on catering skills, have now been subsumed into these Level 2 courses which have a wider curriculum stretching into other aspects of tourism and travel. So it is not a question of discontinuing but rather of updating and upgrading courses provided.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Will the people who were able to take the previous courses also be able to take these ones or are there different requirements, entry requirements or anything like that?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, I am sure that people who have taken the Level 1 before and now feel that they could still have the opportunity to go into Level 2, they would be very welcome to apply, there would be no impediment on their being taken on for that level, the new courses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not talking about the Level 1 going onto the Level 2, presumably there are still Level 1 courses that new entrants can take that are no different from the ones that were there before, or if they are different, is the fact that they are different mean that the potential market is less? The potential market of students has that been altered in any way? Are the changes limiting the people that are able to apply and take the courses?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This falls within the laws of the market, some firms will obviously not require a Level 2 qualification and would welcome a Level 1 student in the previous courses for their purposes, which as I say were more focussed on catering. It depends, I cannot be absolutely exact in my forecasting of what the labour market will tell.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I am afraid the question I am trying to establish is whether in fact the changes that have taken place, not in moving from Level 1 to Level 2, have any of the Level 1 courses been changed in any way?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not quite understand what the hon Member is getting at. The situation is as follows. Before we were providing for students who entered the Bleak House Institute of Training School of Tourism, a Level 1 course with a set curriculum which as I say was more focussed on catering skills. Now we have scrapped that course, although I said it has been subsumed because some of the skills and some of the substance of that course is now taken up in a Level 2 course, which is a BTEC certificated course, which has a curriculum wider than the original one, because that is what the industry has been asking for.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But then it is not a question of going from Level 1 to Level 2. I mean, people go straight into Level 2 without doing Level 1, is that the case?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is so. They do not have to go through a Level 1 course, they go into a Level 2 course but of course there will be elements of what used to be Level 1 subsumed into the Level 2.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore are there people who were eligible to do the Level 1 still eligible to do the Level 2?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Indeed they are. I answered that question that if they apply now for the Level 2 course they would be very welcome.

**NO. 210 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME**

Can Government state how many students are currently enrolled in the Vocational Training Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are currently 176 students enrolled in the Vocational Training Scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 210 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Government state at what stage they are each at, as in are the 176 in the first stage, second stage or third stage of the Vocational training?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There are 17 in intake 5, which is the latest intake, there are 145 still from previous intakes still completing their three year stint in the vocational training scheme, the required training on ESF requirements is three years, and there are 14 who are not under the ESF scheme but subsidised by Government.

**NO. 211 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GASA SWIMMING POOL**

Can the Minister for Education state whether the payments made to GASA for children to attend vital swimming lessons will come from the schools capitation budget?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Payments made to GASA for children to attend swimming sessions at the swim hall as part of their curriculum requirements will not be paid from the schools capitation budgets, nor indeed have they ever been.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 211 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state from what funds these payments are made?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, they are funded from Examination Expenses.

ORAL

**NO. 212 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BULLYING IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how many incidents of bullying have been reported to headteachers in 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 to date giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is on the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 212**

<b>School</b>	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>2004/05</b>
Gibraltar College	-	-	1	-
Bayside	4	6	5	7
Westside	No records available	No records available	3	1
Bishop Fitzgerald	"	6	5	3
Sacred Heart	4	5	7	5
St Anne's	5	4	4	4
St Joseph's Middle	7	2	6	4
Governor's Meadow	1	1	1	2
Notre Dame	-	-	2	3
St Bernard's	3	4	4	3
St Joseph's First	1	1	7	4
St Mary's	1	1	2	2
St Paul's	-	-	-	-
Hebrew Primary	-	-	-	-
St Martin's	-	-	-	-

**NO. 213 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GRADUATES EMPLOYED**

Can the Minister for Education state whether through the Employment Service he has been able to obtain information on graduate employment as he mentioned in answer to Question 649 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

I can confirm that it is now possible, as it was suggested in Question No. 649 of 2004, to match those individuals who graduated in 2003 or any subsequent year for that matter, against employment records held by the Employment Service in order to establish how many went on to obtain employment in Gibraltar. The data computer programme that yields this information has now been updated to yield this information and I will be pleased, I cannot provide it here now, to provide the information the hon Member seeks within a matter of the next two weeks.



**NO. 214 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – POST-16 COMMITTEE**

Can the Minister for Education state whether the Post 16 committee set up by him has met since the publication of the Tomlinson Report and/or after the UK Governments response to the said report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Post 16 committee has not met since the publication of the Tomlinson Report because it has been agreed generally to wait for the final outcome in the UK of the wide-ranging review which is taking place there of all the issues involved.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 214 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

As stated in the question, the UK Government have already given a response albeit not a very, very thorough report, as in specific to each recommendation in the Report but in general they know what they want to do and what they do not want to do. My question is, would it not be sensible if the Post 16 committee would meet to at least discuss the response of the UK Government to that Report. The Minister I have asked this question in the House on previous occasions and the answer is 'yes we are waiting for things to happen in the UK'. But things are happening in the UK, the UK Government have already responded to the Tomlinson Report. One example is that they are going to stay with the A Levels rather than have the international type of baccalaureate tests that was recommended by the Tomlinson Report, and I think it is important for the Minister who set up this committee, rightly so I must say it is right to do that, that he set up this committee in order to look at what we call now 14-19 education. Unfortunately we cannot here in Gibraltar just sit and wait to look and see what happens in the UK, what we have got to do is be pro-active and see how the Government have responded, what were the recommendations. If they have not even met after the Tomlinson Report was published, how can the committee have a view of the Tomlinson Report in itself? So can the Minister, may I say, urge his committee to at least meet and discuss these issues?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Minister does not agree with the assessment and judgement of the Opposition Member and to say that we are sitting and waiting is not correct. The advisers, the experts are very much into what is happening in the UK, the situation is still very fluid, when he says that the UK Government have responded he is referring to the White Paper which has been issued by the Government in response to the Tomlinson Report. It is still very much a discussion paper, we still do not know where things are going, even the NASUWT officers in the UK have told us that and they too themselves are waiting to see what the outcome eventually is going to be that is put before Parliament, and then will become curricular legislation. So by all means there are always informal discussions between the advisers and the officers in the Department and the teachers, and the Head teachers on these issues but the fact that there is a working group is not a sacred institution that has to meet. If they do, it is just going to be a bit of a talking shop about nebulous developments and in any case the advisers are preparing a paper, guidelines, compiling all that is happening in the UK, the Tomlinson Report, the adviser recommendations of the Tomlinson Report, the White Paper, which very often needs to be actually reduced for the sake of teachers who have plenty on their plate rather than just go into a huge, big report. That is the situation as we see it. That is our assessment and that is the way we are moving.

**NO. 215 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SUPPLY TEACHERS & LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government confirm whether teachers and learning support assistants are now being given a contract as opposed to them being employed on a permanent supply basis which does not entitle them to the same rights as any other Government employee?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The supply teachers and learning support assistants have not been as yet provided with contracts. They are still being employed on a supply basis.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 215 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister know if there is any indication as to when, or have they brought out any vacancies for contracts or have they tendered out for contracts, or have they not moved at all on any of these issues? An issue which might I add is important to the person who is on a permanent supply, for obvious reasons like we have had debates before of young people coming over from the UK, getting a permanent supply for a year, wanting to get a mortgage from the bank, the bank not giving them a mortgage because they have not got full time work, all these issues are issues that affect these people. Do the Government have, again and I insist on timetables, because it seems as if there is no urgency on any of the matters that I have asked, time does not pass for them, so may I ask does the Minister have again a timetable or at least a time limit as to when these will come out?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because the Government do not accept the premise of his question which the Government believe is entirely incorrect. The position has not changed since the last time he asked this question. Supply teachers are exactly what the name suggests, people who are called in to cover situations which are temporary. Now the temporary situation may be of shorter or longer duration but it is still temporary as opposed to permanent and one cannot make somebody permanent and pensionable unless the job that they are doing is going to be permanently required. The hon Member has got to distinguish between the concept of supply and the concept of permanence and

temporariness. When teachers do jobs for which there is no permanent requirement, permanent does not mean that it has lasted two years, it could have lasted two years because that is the length of the temporary need, indeed the temporary need could be five years and sometimes is. When we employ, for example, classroom aides to deliver a one to one service to a disabled child, that post is required for the years that that child is in the Middle School for example. That is a temporary requirement. It may be a temporary requirement which is three or four or five years long but it is not a permanent requirement and the Government do not make people permanent and pensionable unless there is a permanent requirement. That said, we have had debates in this House in the past about the terms and conditions that attach to supply workers or people who are not on permanent and pensionable terms, when they have been engaged for some time.

Can I just remind the hon Member that he raises these points as if somehow all of these things had started to happen, the concept of supply workers in very lengthy posts or in time, as if all of these things started in May 1996 and these things never happened before. Can I remind the hon Member that the only Government that have taken a view of a number of supply workers on two occasions and said 'these supply workers and classroom aides deserve to be made permanent and pensionable' have been this Government. It was never done before. So when the hon Member demands timetables, could he at least recognise that the principle of looking to see whether people who have been on supply terms or different terms should be made permanent and pensionable, is something that we have started and we have done for the first time and the previous Governments did not do. So the situation may still not be as perfect as he would like it to be, assuming that we can agree on the definition of perfection, but he should at least recognise that we are the first to have made a serious go. Of course we cannot do this every day, it takes time to assess whether there is a permanent establishment need for particular posts and where I have agreed with him in the past is that whilst somebody is on an extended engagement on supply terms, there ought to be some provision to give him leave entitlement and things of that sort. That is where I have agreed with him in the past as opposed to making permanent and pensionable. Now, it is true that that area, which is where I have agreed with him in the past, appears not to have progressed since last we discussed it, and therefore to the extent that his questions relate to that area where the Government have a degree of agreement on this position, his pressing of the Government in my view has a greater degree of justification than all the areas where we simply disagree with the premise of his question. I think there is a case. Whether we make people permanent and pensionable or not, even if we do not make people permanent and pensionable, to say 'well look if somebody is on supply terms and has been on supply terms for a continuous period of for example 12 months, and that person carries on then there ought to be some provision'. Counter argument apparently, is that the rate of pay for supply workers compensates for the fact that these are the terms, so that has got to be looked at too and a fair conclusion come to.

#### **HON S E LINARES:**

It is incredible to hear what I am hearing today. The AACR used to have contract teachers years ago, where we used to have teachers coming from the UK on contracts because we did not have the local expertise at the time, and that used to be an issue. So the Chief Minister cannot say that his Government is the only Government that is looking into it because he has not done it yet. The supply workers, and he did agree with me that these are not supply workers, it is a contradiction in terms to have a permanent supply, a supply is a teacher who is

sitting at home, so that the Chief Minister understands the difference between a supply teacher and a teacher who has a long or medium-term time to do certain things. A supply teacher is a teacher that is sitting at home in case another teacher gets ill, and I think the Regulations are that they have to be three consecutive days ill and on the fourth day the school is given a supply teacher to cover for the illness or the time period, that is, two weeks, five weeks, two months, even maternity which is 14 weeks to cover for that period, and one gets a supply in. What one cannot do and what the Chief Minister has said, if there are learning support assistants or teachers that have a specific job, for example, a learning support assistant might have a job for five years because there is a child that needs. I understand that I am being pressed to ask the question but I am afraid that the Chief Minister has diatribed for about 10 minutes on the concept of supply. Now, what I am saying is that a supply teacher is there waiting to be called in to cover up. What he is talking about, what he is calling supply is a learning support assistant who has a child who has a problem for five years and needs a learning support assistant to sit beside the child helping to support the teacher. That person will be employed for five years and therefore a contract is needed for five years so that they can get, what one cannot do is get from the supply pool, have that person there for five years, one knows that one has them for five years so why not give them a contract? There is the question. The question was very, very specific and he was the one who has gone on to explain all the things and I am trying to tell him that what he has explained is completely irrelevant, and now I am being irrelevant to the question but I am just answering the Chief Minister. So all I am saying is, and I appreciate that he has admitted that his Government have not moved on this, that is all I needed to know. That is all I needed to know.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not agree with the hon Member. He seems to think that the only use that has historically been made of supply workers in Gibraltar is that they are required to sit at home by the telephone and if a permanent member of staff telephones.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, they are not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is one of the uses of supply workers and indeed it may be the use for which the system was invented but what I am telling the hon Member is that the system has historically been used to cover the sort of situations that he thinks is now too long to be carried out by supply workers and should be carried out by contract workers. When we arrived in office in May 1996, there was a veritable army of people on permanent supply terms.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

No.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What does he mean no? How would he know what we found on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996?

**HON S E LINARES:**

We have had this argument before, he is repeating again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member does not want to hear what I have got to say it can only be because he thinks that what I am going to say does not suit him. He cannot censor what I say in this House or what I do not say in this House. When we arrived in office on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996, as he has interrupted me I have got to start again so I am going to say something twice for better effect. When we arrived in office on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 we found a veritable army of people in precisely the situation that the hon Member has just described and suggested is an improper use of supply workers, and on not one but on two occasions, we have approved converting a list of them, their circumstances, the job that they were doing, how long they had been doing it, assessed on an individual case by case basis and we had to make a number of them, I cannot now remember the exact figure, about 15 in one sitting that I can remember, were made permanent and pensionable. What I am saying to the hon Member is that this is a problem that we inherited and that unlike previous Governments, which was a phrase that I used to avoid saying unlike the previous Government, I was just trying to be a little bit less political, since he contradicts me by reference to the AACR, we set about trying to do something about it. Have we finished? No. There will always be cases, there will always be at any period of time people whom if one evaluates their case may deserve to be made permanent and pensionable just as the 15 that we evaluated and then another batch that I cannot remember the size of were evaluated. That is converting supply workers to permanent and pensionable, which I accept is not what the original question relates to. Yes, but then he has made remarks in supplementaries, I understand that the original question does not relate to the making of people permanent and pensionable but it relates to whether people who are on supply terms should have a contract or not. That issue, in respect of some of which aspects I agree with the hon Member, is not as simple and straightforward as he thinks because there are now rules and EU directives about how long one can continuously renew peoples' contracts for before their employment becomes indefinite.

So, there are factors to be taken into account of whether one is not making them permanent and pensionable by the back door. It is not as simple as simply saying to supply workers 'because you have been here so long, here is a contract'. It is not that simple because as he knows, because I think we passed the legislation together here in this House, there are rules about the number of times that one can repeatedly renew a contract without doing that. These things have got to be taken into account as well, I would rather approach the issue not by means of whether there is a contract or not, but rather by what are the terms of the supply scheme so to speak. So that if somebody has been on supply for a continuous period full-day, has worked in effect a full year just the same number of hours as a permanent teacher, and assuming that the rate of pay, which I do not understand is the case, but if the rate of pay does not compensate them then the scheme might say that for every 12 months of supply work that one does, one is entitled to so many days of paid leave. To introduce that sort of scheme, in other words, to make sure that extended supply

work is not done on unreasonable terms as to leave entitlement and things of that sort, one does not have to give them a contract. All that one has to do is modify the terms of the supply workers scheme and that is the way forward that I would prefer rather than the giving of a contract, which does have potentially serious on-going implications for the tax payer. Now, I admit, to the extent that when we last debated this at some past meeting in the House, I expressed the same views as I am expressing today about lack of leave entitlement, that has not yet been converted into action. To that extent I agree with his questions.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just to put the record straight, his Government might have put some permanent or supply teachers in 1996 when he went in on a permanent and pensionable.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

When we came in.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When he came in, this is what I am saying. What I am saying is that when the Chief Minister came in he might have found one or two teachers that were on those terms, because I, as GTA President, when the previous Government was in power together we put teachers that were, and wrongly because at the time we realised that there were teachers who were eight and even 10, and 11 years if I remember correctly on the supply list.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is what we found.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, he did not find them because they were made permanent and pensionable before he came in. He might have found a few that were left because he got into power but what I can say as a GTA President I fought for those people to be made permanent and pensionable, and they were made permanent and pensionable. Well just to put the record straight.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, he may be talking about teachers.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes teachers, I am only concerned about teachers. We are talking and debating teachers and before he mentioned workers and he might have been mistaken about

what a supply worker is and a supply teacher is. This is the difference, teachers and workers might be different in this sense.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the hon Member presumably, when he was President of the Gibraltar Teachers Association, represented not only teachers but also classroom aides.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No I did not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the question, his Question No. 215 does not relate just to teachers, it says 'and learning support assistants'. Learning support assistants are classroom aides for short and it is not true to say that when we arrived in office there were only two or three classroom aides because he had dealt with them all. His remark may or may not be true, I am not in a position to contradict him, his remarks may or may not be true about teachers, I am talking about the classroom complements of the Education Department, which means teachers, classroom aides, laboratory assistants, and a whole number of other sorts of people.



**NO. 216 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MATERNITY LEAVE**

Can Government state if they have responded to the NASUWT's proposal on the teachers maternity leave entitlement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There has been no response given as yet to the claim by NASUWT.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 216 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state what the proposals are, what is the NASUWT proposing to Government on this issue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Either the hon Member knows the answer to the question, in which case he should not ask it, or he does not know in which case his question is hypothetical. Is he saying that he does not know what the proposal is?

**HON S E LINARES:**

If the Chief Minister does not want to answer it, do not answer it. I am asking the question and therefore if he does not want to answer it do not answer it.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Teachers are now on maternity leave of 14 weeks excluding holidays and they are now claiming 18 weeks excluding holidays. That claim is now being discussed and analysed through the proper channels.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do Government know how much it would be if it excluded holidays, the 18 weeks would be the maximum?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are not willing to entertain any exchange across the floor of the House in what is an outstanding claim by a group of their employees, which is under consideration for subsequent negotiation. We are simply not willing to say anything further on the matter.

**NO. 217 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government confirm that they continue to use the East Side reclaimed area to dispose of construction rubble, and if so, how much longer do they anticipate that they will be able to continue using the site for this purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Government are still using the East Side reclaimed area as a rubble tip. The site will be closed to tipping on or around 31 May 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 217 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Have the Government now decided on a site to replace this one and if so which one?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government are currently considering various options and a decision should be taken shortly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the closure of that site related to the commencement of the bathing season or to the development which will occur on that site?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, it is in relation to the actual development.

**NO. 218 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Are Government satisfied that Gibraltarians are not being discriminated against by Cammell Laird in favour of cheaper labour given the trend that of the numbers of casual workers employed by Cammell Laird the number of Gibraltarians usually amounts to less than half?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 218 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, that short and bland answer really flies in the face of the fact that the statistics provided by the Ministry for Employment tends to show that trend continuing. Now it may be that the Minister believes that a simple yes is enough to answer the question. Even if that were technically the case is he saying to this House that he has absolutely no concerns whatsoever that every time that Cammell Laird, and we look at the Cammell Laird statistics, it is less than half the number of Gibraltarians that are being employed and if that is the case, why is he satisfied, what work is he doing to satisfy himself that this is not an issue of preferring cheaper labour?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The supplementary question there seems to try and create an alarming situation, not by far the case. I think if one looks at the statistical element of it the hon Member is probably right when he says that less than 50 per cent of the casual labour are Gibraltarians, but if he actually looks at the statistics of registered vacancies for casual labour, and one looks at February for example, there were six vacancies out of which two were Gibraltarians. In the month of March there were two and one was Gibraltarian. I mean we are talking of extremely small numbers all the time so I do not think it is something to be alarmed about.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, that is if we look at the statistics for February and for March, but the Minister has pointedly refused, or has pointedly decided not to refer to the statistics for January. The statistics for January is 32 jobs of which only 14 are Gibraltarian. That means that we lost a large number of jobs there. I do not want to be accused of being xenophobic for defending the fact that we should, I think in this House, be interested as much as possible in ensuring that Gibraltarians who are unemployed and I have a ream of statistics of Gibraltarians unemployed, are getting the jobs that are going. Not every Gibraltarian is going to want to be employed in the shipping industry and we must want a diverse job market of Gibraltarians but surely in January, was the Minister not concerned to see 15, 16, 17 jobs going to non-Gibraltarians in that industry?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government do not micro-manage the recruitment policies and practices of individual companies on a week by week or month by month basis. The thrust of the hon Member's questions relate to discrimination. For example, the hon Member does not know what the nature of the skills required from the particular workers in any given month were and whether they were available in Gibraltar by Gibraltarians available or not. He assumes that everyone that is employed that is not Gibraltarian has been preferred over a Gibraltarian candidate, equally qualified, equally available and equally willing, which is what it would require to be the case for him to be justified to use the phrase "discrimination". That is the reason why the Government do not agree with his assessment. If he is asking the Government whether the Government would prefer companies established in Gibraltar to maximise the opportunities that it gives to resident workers, I do not use the phrase Gibraltarians, resident workers before importing workers from any other country, the answer to that is yes. The Government hugely prefer that to be the case.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I was not asking the Chief Minister to micro-manage the job market. That is what he would rather I was asking him so that he could get up and give the answer that he has given. I have asked in my supplementary whether the Minister, whether the Government were concerned at the numbers, that is what my supplementary was about and that is what I have not got an answer to, and I will use the words Gibraltarians and I will put my supplementary again. Are the Government not concerned at least that in the month of January 18 jobs went to non-Gibraltarians? I will use the word Gibraltarian and am not afraid of using the word Gibraltarian because actually that is what the statistic is about, Gibraltarians and non-Gibraltarians rather than residents and non residents. So will the Government answer the question, are they or are they not concerned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer to the question is that the Government are not concerned because we are not aware of the existence of any of the criteria that would justify and sustain concern. The Government would only be concerned if the facts were, which have not been established and which the hon Member speculates about and assumes, that all of these non-Gibraltarians that were employed were preferred over and above. In

other words, that whereas there were Gibraltarians ready, willing and able to do whatever it is that these particular workers were contracted to do, the company nevertheless preferred to go to Bulgaria, or to Spain, or to Germany, well unlikely to be the case to Germany but to some other source of lower cost labour and import them because they are cheaper. The Government would be concerned if that were the case but the hon Member is not entitled to assume that that is the case. The hon Member will remember at the time that we were passing rules, I do not remember if it was the time of the legislation on accession states or whether it was in answer to a question, that he cross-examined the Government about our decision, which we exercised differently to the United Kingdom, not to extend voluntary labour access rights to transitional Member States from Eastern Europe. In other words, the United Kingdom said to all these European States, 'even though you are not entitled, even though your nationals are not entitled to access to freedom of movement rights until the end of the transition period in three, or four or five or six years time, we the United Kingdom are nevertheless going to open our labour markets out to you as of today voluntarily'. Some other Member States did the same, other Member States chose not to and Gibraltar chose not to even though the UK had chosen to do. So the hon Member, and indeed I seem to recall that he was mildly critical of that because at the time he was asking.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respect, I want to allow the Chief Minister to continue with the substance of his answer because I think it is important, but I was not critical of the decision being taken. What I was trying to do was get to the bottom of the legality of how it had been done at the time, but he must not read into that, he often accuses me of making the mistake of assuming things, he must not assume that we were against what was being done. We were simply trying to get to the bottom, the process of cross-examination that he himself has referred to, how it was done.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So by that action of choosing to exercise a different option by the UK, not to extend prematurely transitional access rights to workers from transitional countries, the Government have demonstrated their wish and determination to protect the local labour market in circumstances where it is legally possible to do so. If the hon Member's questions are related to engaging Spanish labour, then he must know that there is very little that the Government can do legally to curtail the use by Gibraltar based companies of labour from another European Union Member State. For the hon Member to suggest, I mean I have not assessed the figures and do not know what the nationalities were of these non-Gibraltarian labourers, to the extent that they were from other EU Member States, the Government really are very hard put to have any lawful device available to them, as he well knows, to influence that situation. Therefore he should not ask questions which may inadvertently lead listeners to believe that there are things that the Government could do with Cammell Laird in respect of EU casual labour which they are simply choosing not to do. As he well knows that is not correct.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

This morning we were talking about Cammell Laird and this afternoon we are talking about Cammell Laird again. In the answer this afternoon the Chief Minister tells me

that he does not micro-manage the market, that he does not know what these other nationalities are et cetera. Yet this morning when he was telling us about the £500,000 that the Government have taken upon themselves to pay in respect of the disposal of that grit mountain, he told us that he looked at the balance sheet of Cammell Laird and determined that they were unable to pay those amounts. Well if the Chief Minister is telling us that he is looking at the balance sheet of this company, then he cannot tell us that he is not involved in the micro-management of issues such as this. Now the statistics which have been made available, do not reflect whether the total of 32 of which 14 are Gibraltarian is made up of non-EU nationals or of EU nationals. I am not asking the Chief Minister whether or not his Government can do anything to prevent EU nationals from getting employment in Gibraltar because I know the answer to that as he himself knows the answer to that, and I would not want listeners to go down the route of thinking that the Opposition is proposing something which it knows is not legally possible. But my question was a very simple one. Are the Government concerned that of the numbers employed by Cammell Laird in each month in January, February and March, and I accept that February and March as the Minister for Trade and Industry has referred us to are very small figures, but January is a much larger figure of 32, are the Government concerned that Gibraltarians are being discriminated against? Now that might not be a question which might attract as much debate in respect of a company that is not receiving in effect a £500,000 subsidy, as we were told this morning that Cammell Laird is. Will the Government simply address that point? Stop obfuscating trying to avoid the issue, and tell us are the Government concerned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, for the third time, I do not know whether the hon Member's definition of obfuscation is not to say something three times as opposed to just once. I think I have already said twice, and am therefore now going to tell him a third time, the Government are not concerned that Gibraltarians are being discriminated against because the Government have no evidence that Gibraltarians are being discriminated against, and nor does he. Cammell Laird are not receiving a subsidy of £500,000, I went to a considerable amount of trouble to explain to him this morning that the Government were dealing with this in the same way as they dealt with the disposal of other refuse in or out of Gibraltar, and because this was a single activity. *[Interruption]* The hon Member says that that is not true, I remember explaining to him at considerable length how the Government disposed of everybody's refuse when we had an incinerator and now dispose of everybody's refuse at Government expense in Los Barrios or wherever it is that the tip is located.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So he sees the balance sheet of every company that has rubbish.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not know whether the hon Member heard the point that he made and whether he is particularly himself persuaded by it, that he should equate in terms of degrees of micro-management my interest in myself in the nationality of the six casual workers that were employed in favour of, non Gibraltarian casual workers, that that is the same degree of micro-management as receiving a request for £500,000 of public expenditure and satisfying myself that it is not expenditure that the

Government should make the company pay, one of the factors of which necessarily has to be, even if there are maybe other factors, whether it is an expense that the company can afford, because if the company cannot afford to do it even if the Government decide that it is something that the company should pay and not the Government because it does not fall into the right, there is no point because the mountain is not going to disappear. So the first question is can the company afford it because if a company cannot afford it, there is no point the Government deciding it should be the company that pays and not the Government unless we are happy to see the mountain stay there. So, I do not know on what basis he says that clearly the fact that I go to the trouble of establishing the question of affordability by the company for what is £500,000 of public funds, therefore proves that I micro-manage to the extent that I concern myself about the details that we are discussing in employment is in my view, I do not suppose he would agree, a huge non sequitur. It is just complete lack of logic on the hon Member's part. Obfuscation. I mean presumably he does not disagree with my definition of discrimination. For there to be discrimination against Gibraltarians there would have to be Gibraltarian workers ready, able and willing to do work and notwithstanding that Cammell Laird should say no. Even though here is a qualified Gibraltarian ready to work, employable et cetera, et cetera I nevertheless prefer to go to Bulgaria to employ somebody because it is cheaper, that is what I understand by discrimination, to save money. I did not understand him to be sort of imputing discrimination on racial grounds simply to save money and the Government do not have any evidence that that is so. If the Government did have evidence that that is so, if anybody complained to the Government 'look I applied for a job in Cammell Laird to stack up boxes', presumably one does not need a sort of degree from Oxford or Cambridge to do, 'and I was nevertheless told that I could not be employed and instead they brought somebody in from Bulgaria', the Government would certainly be interested, would certainly be concerned and would engage with Cammell Laird and try and exercise whatever proper influence were possible to get Cammell Laird to localise their recruitment as much as possible. I do not know whether the hon Member thinks that that is clear or obfuscatory as an answer. I would invite him to take the view that it is quite clear.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, the issue that I take up is this. The only persons who have the necessary information to take this into its logical conclusion are the Minister for Employment and the Chief Minister, because they are the ones who have the register that tells them how many Gibraltarians there are unemployed and what the qualifications of those Gibraltarians are and how many of those Gibraltarians turn up to see whether they can get a job at the Job Centre, at the ETB. They also know what vacancies are open by Cammell Laird and whether those vacancies relate to those people who are seeking employment. Therefore, if the Chief Minister had told this House 'I have looked at that information, I have looked at the Gibraltarians that there are with qualifications looking for employment who fit the criteria of the vacancy opened by Cammell Laird, and I have seen that they do not' then I would accept his answers. But he has the information, he does not tell us that he has looked at it, in fact the way that he has answered this question is blithely to say 'I am not concerned', and in fact his other Minister told us that he was not concerned because the numbers were too small. So I think what I would do is this, challenge the Government to come back with the figures to show that of those who were not Gibraltarians who were employed in the months of January, February and March, for those that were not Gibraltarians with those necessary qualifications on the books of the ETB seeking employment, then I too might lose my concerns. Would the Government agree to do so?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is assuming a huge amount. First of all he is assuming that there were Gibraltarian applicants for the posts, then he is assuming that the ETB system of vacancy advertising, notification, that nobody in the Job Club has done their work. In the Job Club yes, and in the Employment Service generally have done their work. There are systems in place to maximise to the greatest possible lawful extent the access to jobs in Gibraltar by Gibraltarians, and that is not administered by the Minister for this or the Minister for that. It is administered by public administration officials. Why does the hon Member assume, (a) that there were Gibraltarians for these jobs; and (b) that the Employment Service failed properly to administer the system, which incidentally they put in place, in order to do the most that they thought they could do at the time to protect the priority of access to the extent that it was lawfully possible for Gibraltarians. He assumes all of that and as a result of assuming all of that comes to the conclusion that there is discrimination against Gibraltarians, and because I do not immediately rush to assume all the things that he has rushed to assume, he puts into my mouth the words that I am not concerned. I repeat my answer. I am not concerned because there is no evidence of any of the things that would concern me. That is the answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister has moved the goal post now. He has moved the goal post because now in effect what he is saying is 'we are doing the exercise of looking at what Gibraltarians are on the list of unemployed, what qualifications they have, what it is that Cammell Laird, and I assume therefore other employers, are seeking and when they do not employ Gibraltarians we try and ensure that there was not a Gibraltarian who had those qualifications, or that there was not a job gone to an EU national where there is nothing we can do'. That must be what he is saying if he is talking about the systems that are in place that already do that, which I have asked him and the Minister for Employment to do. What is very clear is this, the Government have seen the statistics for January, February and March in respect of employment at Cammell Laird, and are not concerned by them. The Opposition have seen the statistics for January, February and March and are concerned by them. I think that says a lot for our disparate attitudes to trying to do everything possible to ensure that it is the local jobs that are taken up first.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member may think that that is what it means. I do not think anybody listening to this debate can possibly have arrived at the same conclusion. The hon Member has come to his conclusion based on a number of assumptions which he has no right to assume. What I have said is.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have the right to assume whatever I like. I may or may not be right in my assumptions but I have the right to assume it. Enough rights are being trampled over without even the right to assume being trampled upon.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I am inclined to bring this line of questioning to an end. The way I understand it, the question was 'are the Government concerned at discrimination against Gibraltarians?'. The Chief Minister has answered it in his way and I think we have just got to move on.

**NO. 219 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**NURSERY – FLEET PAVILLION**

Can Government state what alternative premises will be allocated to the private nursery situated at the Fleet Pavilion site once construction of this site takes place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No alternative premises have yet been allocated, or rather the premises that will be allocated have not yet been identified, but of course options are under consideration and of course there will be a mutually agreed relocation before they are required to vacate the site, in a way that will not disrupt the continuity of their nursery.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 219 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state whether the costs of the re-allocation will be paid by Government or probably the developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is too early to say that because the relocation may not be permanent it may be temporary, because one of the options under consideration is that the nursery may be capable of being relocated on the site as part of the new school complex, or attached to the new school complex. So the relocation may be permanent or it may be temporary and the extent of the cost that arises and who should pay for it then depends on which option is chosen.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Have the owners of the nursery agreed to move? Are they in a positive mood to move?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We do not expect them to stand in the way of a development which is so hugely in the public interest.

ORAL

**NO. 220 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LIND HOUSE**

Can Government say whether Lind House has any heritage constraint which requires the existing structure to be retained and refurbished as opposed to being demolished?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

That is a matter of opinion. It is actually academic because the technical advise is that the condition of the house is such that it should be demolished and DPC have in fact issued a demolition permit.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 220 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Did the tender specify the existing structure had to be retained in this particular case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 221 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WESTERN BEACH**

Can Government say whether they have any plans for the development of Western Beach and if so what are they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government have been studying the possibility of reclaiming land from the sea in the area north of the runway by Western Beach.

The proposed use of the land would be mainly for commercial and industrial activity.

ORAL

**NO. 222 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADEWINDS DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say whether any entity has objected to the height of the Tradewinds development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No objections have been received from the public.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 222 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are there organisations or entities, like for example the CAA or the MOD or the RAF which perhaps might not be considered the public, being part of the official sector, that have raised such objections or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the MOD would actually have intervened if the height of the building had been any higher than 45 metres. This is not the case so therefore there is no concern.

**ORAL**

**NO. 223 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 18 November 2004 and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Ten meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have been held since 18 November 2004, on the following dates:

7 December 2004  
17 December 2004  
12 January 2005  
1 February 2005  
10 February 2005  
24 February 2005  
3 March 2005  
18 March 2005  
29 March 2005  
14 April 2005



ORAL

**NO. 224 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – GRAND MAGAZINE, ROSIA**

Can Government say whether the application for planning permission in respect of the proposed development at Grand Magazine and Rosia is still being considered by the Development and Planning Commission?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 232, 234 to 243 and 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 225 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – NORTH GORGE**

Has the tender for the re-development of North Gorge now been awarded and if so to whom, in what amount, and can Government say whether this was the highest bidder?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 226 to 229 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 226 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC - BUENA VISTA BARRACKS**

How many tenders have been received for the re-development of Buena Vista Barracks and part of North Gorge?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 225 and 227 to 229 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 227 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – EUROPORT AVENUE**

How many tenders were received for the re-development of the plot of land at Europort Avenue between the GASA swimming pool and the desalination plant, who was the successful tenderer, in what amount, and was this the highest bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 225, 226 to 228 and 229 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 228 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – EX MOT TEST CENTRE**

How many tenders were received for the re-development of the ex MOT test centre at North Mole Road, who was the successful tenderer, in what amount, and was this the highest bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 225 to 227 and 229 of 2005.

**NO. 229 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – LATHBURY BARRACKS**

How many tenders have been submitted to the Government for the re-development of the ex Junior Ranks Club Building at Lathbury Barracks, who was the successful tenderer and what was the amount bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**Answer to Question No. 225**

The tender closes on 27 May 2005 so therefore the tender has not been awarded.

**Answer to Question No. 226**

Again the tender closes on 27 May 2005 so therefore has not been awarded.

**Answer to Question No. 227**

Four tenders were received. The tender was not awarded as the level of premium offered did not justify the allocation of this plot, the redevelopment of which would be more beneficial as part of a more holistic approach in the overall future development of the area.

**Answer to Question No. 228**

Nine tenders were received. The tender was awarded to Longhorn Properties Limited in the sum of £1,457,000.

**Answer to Question No. 229**

Seven tenders were received. The tender was awarded to Sharrock Shand Holdings Limited in the sum of £1,255,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 225 TO 229 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 228 which was the one of the ex MOT Test Centre, the Minister I think has not given me the full answer. We know it was nine tenderers, we know who got the tender and the amount but was this the highest bid?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes it was.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 229 can I ask the Minister whether the bid by Sharrock Shand was actually the highest bid?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes that was the highest tender as well.

**NO. 230 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NORTHERN DEFENCES**

On what date did Government commence refurbishment of the Northern Defences tunnels, what did this refurbishment entail and can Government supply the cost with a breakdown?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government are not carrying out a refurbishment of the tunnels in the Northern Defences, which contain very many tunnels at different levels. It might be desirable to do this in due course but the great number of tunnels involved and the high cost of making tunnels safe means that the Government do not have this project in their list of future works in the short or medium term.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 230 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Did the Government refurbish part of these tunnels a few years ago?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I think the hon Member is referring to the World War II tunnels and the middle galleries.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to those tunnels, my understanding is that after this refurbishment was carried out there was considerable vandalism in the tunnels and in the area, I do not know whether we are speaking of the same ones. Can the Minister say what the position is now, do Government still intend to open the tunnels, to refurbish them and open them to the public or what is the position?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the hon Member should understand that what we refurbished was the World War II tunnels and the middle galleries and that is what he should be referring to and not the Northern Defence tunnel. The works which took place about a year and a half, two years ago was the Phase I of this. There needs to be a Phase II which will take place as soon as the Government feel they are in a position to continue to do so. In the meantime, there is a project to be able to open the tunnels as they are to offer specialised tours of the tunnels in the interim period whilst the Phase II can be undertaken, which would then enable the fully fledged opening of the tourist site.

**NO. 231 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**RAGGED STAFF TUNNELS**

Can Government say whether they have any plans for the development of Ragged Staff Tunnels and state to what use the tunnels are currently being put?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The chambers inside the tunnels are currently used for temporary storage. The redevelopment of the tunnels and chambers is currently being discussed with a particular developer.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 231 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that development of the tunnels and chambers in relation to restoring them and opening them to the public or is it for some other purpose?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the discussions that are being held are currently with the proposed developers of the underground car park at Grand Parade, and using the entrance and exit to those tunnels as the exit point to the underground car park. Obviously that will incorporate the use of some of the chambers there for storage purposes but this is part of the on-going negotiations with the developers of Grand Parade underground car park.

ORAL

**NO. 232 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Has a planning application been made to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the East Side Project and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 234 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

**NO. 233 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government confirm that they intend to relocate marine and waste collection from their present location on the site intended for the Eastside reclamation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes. Various alternative construction tipping sites are being considered and studied.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 233 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My understanding of it, and certainly the approach that was made to the Opposition, this is actually on behalf of a constituent who has a business called Marine and Waste Collection on the area where the rubbish tip is. The question is this business was moved in there when, I believe, Sir Herbert Miles Road was being widened or something and they are still there. What we are trying to find out is, this person has been on that rubble tip now for many years, the business has been on the rubbish tip for many years and he wants to know whether he is going to be moved or not, and if so when?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This question has been answered as if it were relating to the rubble tip, because the question that reached the Government simply says 'can Government confirm that they intend to relocate marine, with a small 'm', and waste collection, so we thought that it was a reference to an activity and not to a company. I do not know who the question relates to. I have seen a list of all the occupants and tenants and whether they are lessees or licensees in the context of relocation planning and I have not seen anybody by this name on any such list. So he must be known to Government by another name. So unless we can be told what the nature of the activity is it might give us a clue.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My understanding is that this is a portacabin which is near the road on the rubble tip and that there are things like excavators and skips and fork lift trucks et cetera. This person was moved there and then was told he was going to be moved somewhere else once the Sir Herbert Miles Road widening and beautification and all of that had been completed. This company, this business has been on the rubble tip for a number of years now, have obviously heard that the East Side reclamation is going to start or planning permission is going to be made for it, and is wondering what is going to happen to him, when is he going to be moved, so that was the purpose behind the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are people who just established themselves there. I do not know whether this is the case of this individual or not. I think the moral of the story is that the hon Member should take a few more details from people who come knocking at their door asking for their help. If he wants to write to either me or the Minister for Trade and Industry setting out at least so that we can identify and let him know what the tenancy, if any, status is but as I say he is not on the list that is presently being used to manage the relocation exercise.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly we have taken all the details that we can, the name, the business, the address, telephone number, and the type of business activity and the location where the portacabin is but I will certainly write to the Minister with that information and any other information I may be able to dig up, and would welcome a reply.

ORAL

**NO. 234 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed funicular project, how many were favourable and how many were against the project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 235 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 235 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the project to construct a funicular and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 234 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 236 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

Can Government say what was the purpose of the preliminary discussions that they had with the persons promoting the funicular project from Casemates to Rock Gun, before any application for planning permission was made?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 234, 235, 237 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 237 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

Can Government say on what date additional information was supplied by 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock Ltd to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed funicular project, and tell the House why this additional information was required and what it consisted of?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 234 to 236, 238 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 238 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY WHARF**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development by:

- a) Commercial Queensway Wharf Ltd and
- b) Queensway Wharf Ltd

in the area of the Cormorant site and MOD Medical Centre, how many were in favour of the project and how many opposed to it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 237, 239 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 239 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY WHARF**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the proposed development by:

- a) Commercial Queensway Wharf Ltd and
- b) Queensway Wharf Ltd

at the area of the Cormorant site and MOD Medical Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 238, 240 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 240 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY/NEW HARBOURS**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development at CP 1544 Queensway adjoining New Harbours, how many were favourable and how many opposed the development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 239, 241 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 241 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY/NEW HARBOURS**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the application made by Belmond Ltd for a proposed development at CP 1544 Queensway adjoining New Harbours and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 240, 242, 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 242 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development at the so-called mid-town project in Queensway, how many were favourable and how many were opposed to the development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 241, 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 243 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the application by Commercial Developments Investments Ltd in relation to the so-called mid-town project in Queensway and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 242, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 244 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

What steps did Government take to establish whether any other developer would have offered them a better deal for the mid-town project before it was directly allocated to Commercial Developments Investments Ltd?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 245 to 247 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 245 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

What is the area in square metres of the mid-town project, with a breakdown of each of its component parts also in square metres?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 244, 246 and 247 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 246 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government list the criteria that was used to reach a valuation of £10 million for a school, park, car park and leisure centre in exchange for the land in relation to the mid-town project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 244, 245 and 247 of 2005.

**NO. 247 OF 2005****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government say whether the Ministry of Defence have expressed any concern at the planned height of the main tower of the mid-town project?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

This premium was the result of a negotiation and not the application of any specific criteria. I would refer the hon Member to the press release issued by the Government on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2005, which stated that the premium paid for this site by Commercial Developments Investments Ltd was the highest premium rate ever paid to the Government for a project.

The area in square metres of the mid-town project, with a breakdown of each of its component parts also in square metres is as follows:-

<b>Area</b>	<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>
King's Bastion	4,290
King's Bastion Park	1,265
City Park	4,900
School	2,500
Royal Tower	1,200
Princess Gate	1,400
Retail in Nelson Square	4,000
Nelson Square	1,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20,555</b>

This agreement will deliver valuable amenities to Gibraltar and the Government, including a school, a public park and a leisure centre. An additional value to the Government is the fact that, inevitably, it would have cost considerably more for the Government themselves to build these facilities. Additionally, the Government would have been exposed to the risk of cost overruns instead of the developer. In addition, the development will provide public underground parking near the centre of town. The Government have frequently said that they would exceptionally make direct allocations where a project is particularly in the social and economic interests of Gibraltar.

The MOD, on behalf of the RAF have raised the issue of the height of the mid town tower and have asked that an aeronautical study be undertaken by the developers to demonstrate that it will have no impact on airfield safety and operations or otherwise.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 244 TO 247 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister referred me to the press release that they issued on 22<sup>nd</sup> February which conveniently I have here. I will take one issue at a time. In relation to the premium the Minister mentioned that this was the highest premium ever paid to a Government for a development in Gibraltar, but is it not the case that in terms of the actual height of the tower, it is also one of the tallest developments to go up in Gibraltar and that using the Government's own valuation criteria on the basis of density of construction, that is to say on floors of construction, it is logical that it should have been the highest. Our contention obviously as the Minister knows, and that was what the question he was answering, whether we felt the project had been undersold. Is it not the case, using the Government's own density valuation rather than our own valuation in terms of square metres and size of area of the project, that in fact the project has now been undersold by even more, using their own valuation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is not the case. The premium rate payable on this development is the highest. Now of course the premium rate is per developable square metre. The developable square metre depends on how many square metres one is going to build, how many one builds is a product of height. What is being sold is the land and of course it is not all the land that is being sold, it is only the footprint on which the three middle bits, the historical King's Bastion where the leisure centre is going is not being sold, the bit where the park is going is not being sold, the bit where the school is going is not being sold so out of the whole site one has got to say well how much of it has actually been purchased by the developer? It is a good deal less than a third of the whole site. Now, that is the land that is being sold and that is the land for which the development towards the premium which has a value of £10 million, or whatever it costs them to build the amenities, may be more than £10 million. Well, highly unlikely to be less because the Government have not just accepted whatever figures the developer has drawn up. When the Government decide to accept the construction of assets instead of cash, of course they go to the trouble to make sure that they are getting constructions worth the amount of cash that they think they should be getting. That is why we say in answer to this Question that in addition to having done that, a second revalue is the fact that invariably when the Government procure a project it costs more. Private developers screw down, or negotiate, or are able to obtain more competitive prices from construction companies than public sector procurers invariably do. Therefore, to get these assets built for what in effect is a fixed price to the Government now, even though the thing is not going to be built except over a period of time, is something that has an additional value over and above the value that we are attributing to the assets because the developer runs the risk. The Education Department has specified a school, of a certain size with so many classrooms, for so many people, with a certain design, and he is going to build it. It cost him much more and if it does that extra cost is for his book, so we think that this is a very good deal for the public interest, for the Government in its wider context, it secures a development project which is in itself economically valuable activity, and

in addition to achieving that, it procures at no outlay and no resource effort, and no management effort and at a fixed price for the Government, a number of valuable public amenities. The policy of the Government is that the disposal of public lands goes out to tender and it all invariably does go out to tender, but we have also always also stipulated that when there are exceptional proposals that are in the public interest, exceptionally in the economic and social interests, that the Government would consider direct allocations and this was such a proposal. The alternative is that when a developer comes along and says 'look, if you let me build this on that site I will build a school for you and I will do this for you and I will do that for you' I would say 'hang on that is an excellent idea. I am now going to get your idea and I am going to put it out to tender and give other people the opportunity'. This is different to the sale of a piece of land virgin. If the Government were just selling a piece of land, as there are many other tenders that have been advertised, then that is just a matter of price really. But when somebody comes to the Government and says 'look here is a specific development proposal', well the Government either says 'yes, that is a particularly interesting package proposal for Gibraltar I am willing for that project to allocate the land to you directly', which is what we have done here, or we say as I said a moment ago, 'thank you for the idea, I am now going to put out to tender for all your developer competitors to see if they can steal it off you by bidding better'. On that basis nobody would ever put a proposal to the Government and that is the basis of this particular transaction. None other.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Question No. 244 I do not think had been answered in the original answer, although the Chief Minister has now volunteered information. The question was how was the Government able to establish, have the Government been able to establish, whether any other developer would have offered a better deal? Really the answer is that we do not know because we have not actually gone out to any other developers, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it is like my asking my predecessors in office how will they know that somebody would not have made them a better deal for Europort than the Dutch. There are some proposals which are evaluated and which Governments are elected to make judgements. In our judgement this, both on financial grounds and on public amenity procurement grounds and on protecting the tax payer from escalating cost of construction or variations in the developer risks, is a very good proposal. As it was a very good proposal the Government thought that it justified the exceptional, and I think that this is one of only one or two direct allocations that we have done. In our judgement the Opposition Members may disagree and in our judgement we think on all those grounds, even on the simple cash valuation, never mind all the other things, we think it is an exceptional circumstance that justifies exceptionally departing from what is our policy, it has not been policy in Gibraltar in the past, that all disposing of public assets go out to tender. It is not a breach of the policy, the policy is not that everything goes out to tender, the policy is that everything goes out to tender except exceptionally, by direct allocation and not tender, when a particular proposal is thought to be exceptionally in the public interest.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I think the Chief Minister has misunderstood what I am saying. The criticism is not as to whether this was tender or directly allocated. The point that we are making is that even if it would have been directly allocated, could it not have been directly allocated to somebody else for a larger amount, and then would not the Government and the tax payer have derived more benefits from this?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure the hon Member is disregarding my answer because I think he started this supplementary by saying that I had just answered the information, so I think he may have acknowledged that I had dealt with this issue. If the Government were to do what the hon Member is indirectly suggesting the Government ought to have done, which is to put this out to some sort of market testing, it would have required the Government to explain what the proposal was, because the Government did not say this piece of land is for sale. The Government did not go up to a developer and say 'do you want this piece of land? How much will you pay me for it? £10 million, done'. That is not how it happened. I have explained to the hon Member that there are occasions on which developers bring specific proposals to the Government and that people come and say 'look, I would like to build this project there, and this is what I will do for you. I will do this, I will do that, I will include this, I will include that, I will build this, I will build that'. Then the Government have a decision to make. The Government could say 'no, go away. I am not willing to dispose of this piece of land unless it is by public tender', and miss that opportunity, or make the tender around this man's idea, this particular developer's idea.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Chief Minister not agree there is a third choice, which is that the Government could say that they have had a proposal for this area, anybody that has got any idea that they would like to put forward to the Government can come forward and we will consider it alongside, without having to give away what the first one has said.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because the Government wanted the proposals that were put to it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

They were lucky that the guy was clairvoyant.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the guy is not clairvoyant, the consortium which by the way is a very wide consortium that includes many of Gibraltar's property developers today, came to the Government and put a proposal. Frankly, for the Opposition Member to be making that representation to the Government when, when he was in Government practically none of these things were put out to tender, I think is a little bit rich. This is the

application of our policy which is, public tender is the norm, exceptionally in certain circumstances, it will be done by direct allocation. I do not know if this is the first or the second example of the caveat out of the generality, and that is what the Government have done. If in future another developer came up with a proposal which the Government thought exceptionally merited for some other site, the Government would consider a direct allocation as well. What the Government will not do is simply sell land, 'here is a bit of public land, do you want it?' The Government will not do that by direct allocation. The Government will always do that by public tender, but this is the Government's willingness to provide the land, at a price obviously, to facilitate a particular concept project that somebody has bothered to work out and to present to the Government and has incurred expenses, I suppose in running it up, and in those circumstances the Government think that it is justified in doing exceptionally what historically in Gibraltar was the norm with all asset disposal by the Government. I think that is reasonable. If the point that the hon Member is making is, 'well yes, but if you had gone to other people and said look well how much will you pay me for this site, and build me a school and build me this and build me that?' that would be touting around town a proposal that had originated in other people, and the Government do not think that that is ethical.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister seems to be contradicting himself, because he says that it was the initiative of this group, which seems to include almost every developer, I do not know who is left out to put up a competing bid anyway from one of his remarks, but at the same time it was what the Government wanted to do with it. Well look, is it that the Government wanted to do it.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not said it was what the Government wanted to do with it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, that was when I said that they must be clairvoyant because they actually came up with the idea that fitted what the Government wanted to put in those places. If the Government had no pre-conceived ideas and they decided to have a school there because a developer thought that it was a good idea to have a school there, or they decided to have a leisure centre in King's Bastion because a developer decided, no, they have been talking about the leisure centre well before the developers came along. So there was nothing in my judgement for them to say 'well look, we would like' before the developer came up with the idea, 'we would like to do a leisure centre and we would like to do a school', if that is what they feel is needed to meet the Government's own requirements. All they were saying is that if they would had had an alternative they would have been better able to evaluate how good value for money it was. We are not saying they have done anything that is somehow wrong because they allocated it with this idea to these people, who seem to be according to him a very large group anyway.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, but that is not how it happened. They did not have to be clairvoyant to know, the Government's desire to see a leisure centre in the King's Bastion, as they reminded me this morning, has been known since my 1996 election manifesto. The Government's desire to see a school built in that area has been publicly known long before, I think it was in the manifesto too. The initiative, which actually in fairness is not a Government initiative, for a public car park to be built somewhere I think was the subject matter of a Chamber of Commerce, so all they have done is got together, they did not need to be clairvoyant, all they have done is read the Government's election manifestos, they have read the Chamber of Commerce's annual reports and they have put it all into a package and put it in front of the Government on a silver plate. That is how it has happened. It is not that they clairvoyantly or that we somehow have given them a hint as to this is something that this is what we would like to see, now go off and present us something. It is all there in the public domain and all they have done is to wrap it up in a package, have the foresight to say to the Government 'do you want this done? Do you want that done? I will do it all'. That is all that has happened. That is how it has happened.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it is not quite the same as coming along with a project to do something that nobody has ever thought of, and then going round touting it for other people, because in fact they may have had the initiative to approach the Government but of course the Government would equally have initiated that process by saying 'anybody interested in doing this can put ideas to the Government', like they do with other things. Can I ask the Chief Minister is it the case that the bid that is going to be financed by these developers has to happen before they get hold of the land that they are going to develop for themselves?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They have the opportunity to do it in phases, except that the leisure centre must start in June. The rest, they have the opportunity to do in phases. The building of the school has to be contemporaneous with the building of the first commercial structure. So, the answer to the hon Member is not before, the only thing that they have got to do before anything is the leisure centre, because the leisure centre they start and pay for in June. They then can start building within a certain period of time, but I do not remember now what it is whether it is getting planning permission out to them, full planning permission and all of that and procure, they can then decide whether they do two buildings, or one and if they decide to do one which one. In either event, the school is done at the same time as that. So it is not before but at the same time as, insofar as the school is concerned and the leisure centre comes before any other construction. The last thing that happens is the gardens because that is in effect the site office.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could the Chief Minister explain to me this question of planning permission for the leisure centre? This morning I was told that because it was a Government project, planning permission was not required.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct, they need planning permission for their bits but not for our bits. So for example, they are in effect contractors in respect of the school, the leisure centre and the park, they do not need to get planning permission for that. Of course the Government go through their own internal process of ensuring that building standards and safety calculations and all of that, they do not have to go for example through public consultation and all of that but they do have to go through that process for their bits of it. The Royal Tower, the Princess Gate, the Retail Nelson Square and the Nelson Square, because this is that they are doing that on their own account. The bits that they are doing for the Government, I do not know if the hon Member knows that the Town Planning Ordinance does not apply to the Crown, that is why the Government do not need planning permission for their projects.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In answer to an earlier question we were told that there were 10 representations made against this project and actually none in favour. Can the Chief Minister say what was the purpose of the public participation then, given that all the representations made to the DPC were actually against it, and perhaps he could elaborate on what grounds?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is most unusual for people to exercise this open planning process, but very few people ever say anything in favour of projects, but it is possible that something is so magnificent that people are delighted to see it go up. So it is not unusual for all the representations received to be against, because this whole opportunity for people to express their views is to give people, mainly people who are opposed to express their views and the reasons why they are opposed, but of course that does not mean that the DPC converts, and indeed the law does not permit them to, the decision on the basis of a vox populi. This is not planning by referendum. The DPC is obliged to make its decision only by reference to the statutory criteria that are set out in the Town Planning Ordinance, and the number of people opposed to it or whether they are a majority or a minority, is not a consideration that they are lawfully permitted to take into account. What they are permitted to take into account is any issue brought to their attention by people making a representation which falls under one of the statutory criteria upon which they can make a decision. Frankly, for a project of this size, magnitude and location, with all the supposed criticisms of, I hear it has been baptised 'the thermos flask' in Spanish, for all the alleged controversy, 10 representations of opposition is by no means an overwhelming measure, or rather a measure of overwhelming opposition. Still, it is right that people now have an opportunity to express their views and that the DPC takes those views into account, insofar as it is lawful for them to do so. But I think the hon Members, certainly the Leader of the Opposition who has exercised Governmental responsibilities, will know that people like to get a flat or a house but then once they have got one they tend to oppose to any other flats being built around them for other people to have houses. One of the tough decisions that we had was that no sooner had Westview Park gone up, there are things between Safeways and the water front there, had gone up and everybody had bought their own house and were very excited naturally at their own house, but they objected to Euro Plaza being built. There is a tendency to say 'well here I am now, I really object to anything that spoils my view' and on that basis a small place like Gibraltar would never be developed. If a dozen people opposing a

scheme resulted in the Government not authorising the scheme, in a small place like Gibraltar nothing would ever get done because almost everything that is done adversely affects 10 or 12 or perhaps even a greater number of people. One has to balance that with the economic development of Gibraltar.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There are still two more issues that I want to raise in relation to this series of questions. Are the Government satisfied that heritage considerations have been adequately safeguarded in relation to the leisure centre going in King's Bastion?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, as may be known, the Gibraltar Heritage Trust is represented on the Development and Planning Commission. They have put forward their views and in fact some of their considerations and views have been noted for the developers to take into account when the project goes forward.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

And specifically in relation to the leisure centre which I think is what the hon Member was asking about. The answer is yes, we have submitted the proposals to the Heritage Trust, I have personally walked the site with the Chairman of the Heritage Trust and another member of the committee, we have taken on board all their advice and recommendations. Of course they would prefer, I mean the sort of heritage puritan and the sort of person who thinks that heritage is there to be gawked at and not to be incorporated into the fabric of society and therefore not to be touched or leant against or anything like that, would much prefer for the Government to spend a large sum of money just sort of tarring the place up so he can sit there for another 300 years. So I am sure that there are people in the Heritage Trust who would much rather we did not fiddle about building a leisure centre in it and all that. The reality of it is that the Government's policy, subject to advice and subject to consultation and being as sensitive as possible to the historical heritage value of things, is as far as possible to convert it into useable assets, which does not compromise the heritage importance and this is being done now in many parts of Europe and the world. It brings heritage alive if it is converted into something which is useable by contemporary current generations. So, yes, it does involve sort of putting restaurants and cafeterias and discotheques and ice-skating rinks and all these sorts of things where guns used to be fired from and people used to stand around in sort of red tunics. All that is true and it does involve, without interfering with the footprint of the building, it does involve doming the central courtyard. So if one were to impute when this project is done, assuming it is done on the basis that it is presently under consideration, if one looked at King's Bastion sort of bird's eye view from above, one would still see the wall, the roughly mushroom shaped protrusion from the Line Wall which is the King's Bastion itself, and all that would be perfectly visible and that is not cluttered, nothing is being built on top of the line of the building but then that internal courtyard, which the hon Member may be familiar with, it is not very obvious now because it has got modern buildings built inside it, all those are being demolished, that is where the bowling alleys will go on one floor, and the ice-skating rink and the cinemas and things on the other and all that will be arched over so one will see the King's Bastion with no buildings in the middle and a sort of dome over the central

courtyard. That is what it will look like. Heritage Trust is content with that but they might have preferred nothing to be done there at all.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The final issue that I wanted to raise in relation to this was the objection by the Ministry of Defence on behalf of the RAF that the Minister alluded to or told the House in his original answer. I think it was that an aeronautical impact study of the height of the main tower on the airfield and the runway was one of the things that the MOD wanted to see. Is that on the list of conditions for the developer to do or has that been disregarded?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It is on the list of developments that need to be undertaken.

ORAL

**NO. 248 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

On what date was the new development plan first submitted to an Environmental Impact Assessment and on what date was the assessment completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 243 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 249 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Who is producing the Environmental Impact Assessment into the new development plan which was announced by the Minister for Trade and Industry on GBC's Viewpoint programme on 27 January?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

**Schedule to Question 249**

**Answer to Question 224**

Outline Planning permission has been granted.

**Answer to Question 232**

No planning application has been submitted to date.

**Answer to Question 234**

When the application was submitted in August 2003 the Development and Planning Commission received two letters of objection.

Following submission of the required Environmental Statement (submission dated 21 December 2004) the Development and Planning Commission received a total of 7 letters of objection (including one letter containing 26 signatures).

**Answer to Question 235**

No planning permission has been granted.

**Answer to Question 236**

The promoters of the project made a presentation to various Government officers and the Minister for Trade and Industry at the time to appraise them of the project and to discuss any issues of concern. A similar presentation was made to the Development and Planning Commission on 31 July 2003 to appraise Members of their proposals. The Outline Planning Application was submitted on 21 August 2003.

**Answer to Question 237**

The further information was received on 18 March 2005. The further information was required to clarify certain aspects of the Environmental Statement. The further information caused many topics too numerous to mention but included, for example, information on construction timescales, details of supporting infrastructure, more information on proposed stabilisation works, etc.

**Answer to Question 238**

Correction it is Queensway Wharf Ltd and not Commercial Queensway Wharf Ltd.

Only one representation received against the project.

**Answer to Question 239**

Outline Planning Permission has been granted to Queensway Wharf Ltd.

**Answer to Question 240**

No representations were received regarding this project.

Cont.....

**"Contd" Schedule to Question 249**

**Answer to Question 241**

Outline Planning Permission was granted on the 28 February 2005.

**Answer to Question 242**

Ten representations were received against the application. None were received in favour of the development.

**Answer to Question 243**

Outline Planning Permission has been granted by the Development & Planning Commission, but the relevant permit is now being prepared.

**Answer to Question 248**

Work on the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Development Plan commenced in late September 2004. Following agreement of the scope of the assessment in November/December 2004 the consultants produced a draft Environmental Report in January 2005. Following consideration of this Report amendments to the draft Plan are being made and the consultants will then produce a final Environmental Report in the light of the amendments. The Report will be published simultaneously with the draft Plan.

**Answer to Question 249**

Land Use Consultants of Bristol

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 224, 232, 234 TO 243, 248 AND 249 OF  
2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Grand Magazine and Rosia development where outline planning permission has been granted, is it possible for the Minister to say whether this has been granted to the development in the form in which the application was made or whether changes have been made to it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Could the hon Member please repeat the question.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 224, outline planning permission has been granted for the development at Rosia and Grand Magazine. Has that been granted in the way in which the application was made or has the application been altered in any way by the DPC?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These are outline planning and in this case it is an outline planning, and outline planning in the case of a major development like this are normally granted with a number of provisos and requirements. In this case it does have a list of provisos that the developer will need to address in order to be able to submit the final outline or the final application.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I remember correctly when we discussed this at the previous House, the one concern that had been expressed by residents of the area and I believe a petition had also been collected, was due to the actual scale of the project and the height of the project. Does the Minister know whether that has been addressed in one of these points or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot recall. I do remember that it was an issue that was discussed by the Commission but I do not believe I can remember what the position was in respect of that.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 236, that is the one to do with the funicular project and the preliminary discussions that took place, can I ask the Minister who were the



Government officers who were present at the DTI when this presentation was made in relation to Question No. 236?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Both developers of the funicular have made presentations to a number of Government officers and to the Minister or my predecessor at the Ministry for Trade and Industry. I was actually made a presentation as well as Minister for Tourism so basically it was not just one presentation. This has gone over a period of time where the developers have seen fit to contact various interested parties and make basically presentations to them in order to get some feedback in their respective areas of interest. Obviously, when I had the presentation made as Minister for Tourism, the focus was very much of a new tourist site and what that meant for tourism. I know that there was a presentation made to other Ministers and other Government officials in the Department of the Environment, in Trade and Industry et cetera in order to gauge feedback from some Government officials in different areas of competence.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the questions on the Mid-Town project, that is Question Nos. 242 and 243, the answers given were that there were 10 representations against this development and none in favour, and that outline planning permission has been granted. In this particular case can the Minister say, I remember that one of the concerns expressed at the time was the actual scale and height of one of the main towers, would that be altered in any way or will there be a condition placed in relation to the height?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, the height of this particular building will be subject to an aeronautical study which I think will be the determining factor as to the height of the building. The outline planning in respect of this particular project has been approved subject to a number of conditions by the Development and Planning Commission. Due to the complexity and magnitude the Department is currently going through the relevant process in order to put these as part of the conditions to the actual permit and until that happens the permit is not issued as such but I did not want to mislead the House when answering the Question because the Commission has actually approved it and has stipulated the conditions about the permit not being issued.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

One issue which arises in relation to this particular project is the relocation, presumably by the Government or by the developer I do not know by who, of existing tenants in the area. Is that an issue which has been resolved or agreed by the tenants?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the hon Member is probably referring to the nursery that exists in the Fleet Pavillion area, is that correct, which I think is the subject of one other Question on the

order paper? Alternatives, obviously are being considered for this particular nursery but it has not yet been agreed on a place to relocate them.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Moving on now to Question No. 248 which is the Question on the new Development Plan, the answer given by the Minister is that the environmental impact assessment on the plan commenced in late September and a draft environmental report was produced in January 2005. Can the Minister say when it is envisaged that the Development Plan itself will be ready?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot really give a commitment on that. I think the House has to understand that this is being done in-house rather than being out sourced and therefore it is something that the Planning Department is doing amongst a lot of other issues, and particularly in the last few months we have been inundated with projects and applications. One can see by the number of meetings that the Development and Planning Commission have met, we have met 10 times in the last three months, and usually the Commission used to meet about 12 times, once a month. So there has been an exceptional amount of applications coming through. However, we are now almost at the end of the draft which will be put to the Government and to the Development and Planning Commission for consideration before we go out to public consultation but most of work has already been done.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

But I understand that the practice has been to issue these plans every 10 years or so and the last one dates back to 1991. Given the considerable time since the last plan was produced and given the considerable number of developments which the Minister has just alluded to, what I have not heard from him is exactly what time scale is all this envisaged to take place so that the plan can be in place, so that people who then submit developments or are interested in particular areas know exactly what the zoning of Gibraltar is going to be.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, this Development Plan is long overdue. However, we are hoping that within the next few months the plan will be in place and will have the relevant information available for forward planning in the different areas of Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask the Minister whether he has made a declaration to the Development and Planning Commission, which I understand he is now the Chairman of, of the fact that there was a presentation to him in his earlier capacity as Minister for Tourism and is that reflected in the minutes of the relevant meeting of the DPC?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I see no reason why that should be the case. The fact that a presentation was made to me prior to being appointed as Chairman is really irrelevant, in the sense that the Chairman of the then Development and Planning Commission was made presentations as well as were officers of the Government who are members of the Commission themselves. I really do not know whether they were minuted at the time but I definitely did not feel that I had to make any declaration to that effect.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The simple answer is no. The Minister had a presentation made to him in relation to a subject which is now before the Commission which he is now the Chairman of and he has not made a declaration to the Commission of that. That is the simple answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the simple answer is no he has not and he does not think that one was required. That is the simple answer, if he wants the simple and full answer as opposed to the simple and self-servingly distorted answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not know why it is that the Chief Minister feels it appropriate to say that that is a self-serving spin that I put on the issue, but I certainly believe that it would be in the interests of openness that people who are sitting in a Commission, the Minister and I have long experience of being involved together in a hearing that I am sure neither he nor I would rather remember, in the spirit of openness everybody round the table should know that the Chairman, albeit in another earlier capacity, received information or a presentation in relation to this particular project. Surely that must be the fair theme and to be fair to the Minister he has told the House and therefore it is public, I am simply asking whether he had that reflected in the minutes of the DPC or whether perhaps he will agree to refer it to the DPC next time that they meet and simply make a short declaration like a director might make a declaration of an interest in a project which his company is going to become embarked on. But I see that the Chief Minister is raring to go.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Just for the record let me say that the Government wholly disagree with the hon Member's point. The Minister has no interest in the matter just because he has had a presentation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. I have not said that the Minister has an interest, I would not wish that to be on Hansard as being for one moment what I have suggested. I was simply analogising that in company law, as the hon Member is aware, if a director has an interest in a project that a company is undertaking, he simply makes a declaration of interest. Now this is not a case.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So what is the analogy then?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The analogy is very simple. An individual sitting in a board considering an issue makes a declaration of things which may be relevant. Now, in this instance the relevance is that he has had a presentation made at an earlier date, in another capacity, in respect of which the same information that is put by the proposed developer before the Commission may have been put to him or it may be different information that is being put to him, but I simply rise to make a point of order so that it is not for one moment suggested that I am suggesting that the Minister has an interest. I do not believe he has, if I believed he did I would have said so.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is learning how to move goal posts himself. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. The Government do not agree. Ministers sit on the DPC because they are Ministers, to represent the Government with whatever knowledge they have as Ministers of the Government. The suggestion that this is somehow something characteristic that needs to be exceptionalised and recorded, and minuted and declared is a nonsense. That is why they are members of the DPC, to take to the deliberations of the DPC not just considerations of Government policy but indeed also information that they have. This is not a reason for recording, okay he said he does not mean interest, a knowledge, well look if everybody that takes part in a commission has to make a declaration of his knowledge I hope everybody who presumably have a lot of knowledge, they would have to spend a hell of a long time making declarations because if one has to declare everything that one knows about the subject matter that is under discussion, well that is not so. The Government do not share the hon Member's analysis. The Government do not think that Ministers that have presentations made to them in their Ministerial capacity in terms of information provided should then declare to the DPC or anywhere else, or minute it, or declare it orally or in writing, that they have received this representation, that is true of most development projects. Most development projects that go to DPC, the submission of a planning application is the culmination of a process which has for months invariably involved consultation with Government Ministers and Government officials, or is the hon Member suggesting that when previous administrations negotiated the Europort site, the previous Minister for Trade and Industry who was fronting that, went along to DPC when it was time to give planning permission to Europort and said *'hang on chaps, I want you all to know that I was flown by private plane to Denmark by the developers of Europort and of course I know all about it because I have a lot of knowledge because I have had a lot of meetings with them and a lot of presentations'*. That is absurd, that is not how Government works. The hon Member may not know it but I am certain some of his Colleagues next to him do. It would simply convert the DPC into something which he may think it should be but is not and never has been, and that is some sort of tribunal which is wholly independent, almost like a court, that is not what the DPC is. The DPC is a body which is a mixture of internal Government and external Government people and it does not pretend to be, of course it has got an obligation to be fair and to take statutory considerations into account and not to take non-statutory considerations, so it is subject to statutorily established criteria but it does not pretend to be something which is independent of the Government in the sense that there is no overlap,

personnel, clearly there is. Therefore to try and set up, register information and/or interests, and/or knowledge and or presentation or whatever is to pretend that it is something much more independent of the public administration than it actually is in fact. So just as he has recorded at some length what he thinks the position should be, I just wanted to make it quite clear that the Government do not share that analysis, do not think that that should be so and that the party of which he is now a member when it was in Government, did not think so either.

**NO. 250 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

Can Government say whether the proposed construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade is going ahead?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There is a proposal which the Government are considering for the construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade. Discussions with the potential developers continue. It is not possible at this stage to confirm whether or not the proposal will go ahead.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 250 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The last time I think the question was raised in the House the answer was a similar one, discussions were still continuing. Are those discussions progressing towards a conclusion and are we to expect a conclusion shortly or are we still very far from having an agreement?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the discussions are progressing and at present basically we are at the stage of preparing draft heads of agreement which are currently being negotiated between lawyers.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Similarly to, well kind of parallel with the mid town project, but we loan the car park at the end of the day, has that been decided now? And what will the Government receive in exchange for this development?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would prefer not to make an announcement on this particular point until the heads of agreement have been signed, but there is a financial consideration being considered and royalty fees being considered after the post development.

ORAL

**NO. 251 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**LIND HOUSE**

Can Government state what is the surface area in square metres of the site on which Lind House is situated, including the area occupied by the building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The total plot area is approximately 2,177 square metres.



ORAL

**NO. 252 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**LOQUAT HOUSE**

Can Government state what is the surface area in square metres of the site on which Loquat House is situated, including the area occupied by the building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The total plot area is approximately 2,072 square metres.

**NO. 253 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government confirm that the Development Aid granted to the International Casino for repairs and alterations will be available to be offset against operating profits on completion of the works?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 253 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the answer to Question No. 1787 of 2004 which finished up saying 'companies cannot have development aid that is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of the project' is not quite accurate, is that not the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Could the hon Member please repeat the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In a previous meeting of the House when I asked about how the development aid was used up and whether if it was not used up it continued to be offsetable against other income streams, the answer given in answer to Question No. 1787 was 'companies cannot have development aid that is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of a project' and in the list this is one of the areas where tax relief development aid has been granted. That is why I asked specifically about this one because in this case manifestly, repairs does not seem to be a project which has a finite date like building a building and then selling it. So the answer that I was given the last time is obviously not accurate in this instance.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This is an application by the International Casino for a specific project of improvement with a specific value to be done over a specific time period, and as long as they meet that criteria then they can offset what has been allowed by the Development Aid Committee for this particular project.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but my question previously Question No. 1787, related to whether when the project was finished the development aid which the company is entitled to take tax free profits continued until it has been exhausted, until it had been used up.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Unused.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the development aid is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of the project.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What was the question?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I have got the answer but I have not got the question, but the question in the supplementaries.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What was paid not used up.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think in the supplementaries to that Question, what the Government argued was that in fact since companies built buildings and then sold them off, even if the profit that they gained did not swallow up the tax relief, there was no way in which the balance could be used against other income. In instances such as the International Casino surely that is not the case. That is to say, if for the sake of a hypothetical example to illustrate it, if the Casino gets development aid of 100 per cent on repairs of £500,000 then presumably they will not start paying tax until their on-going profits on their on-going operations exceed £500,000. Is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I think that is not the impression that was given in answer to Question No. 1787 of 2004.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so, I cannot say that I recollect exactly the question or the answer last time so I am on thin ground. The fact is that there cannot be any dispute about this, one submits a project, one gets a certain percentage value of the project allowed for development aid so if the project is £100 and one gets 60 per cent, one gets £60 that one can offset against future profits. Therefore one does not pay any tax on any income until one has made £60 worth of profits. Now, if no profit is made one cannot offset the aid against anything. On the contrary, one is building up offsetable losses carryable forward. I just do not see what the scope could have been for misunderstanding last time, that is simply how development aid works and I am not sure I understand what the hon Member thinks we indicated to him last time that is not consistent with that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the way the answer was given to me in supplementaries the last time, which was in answer to a series of questions which were Question Nos. 1783 to 1787 of 2004, the thrust of it was that if for example, if Taylor Woodrow builds Queensway Quay the development aid on Queensway Quay can only be used for the profit on Queensway Quay and not the profits of the company.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Now if the International Casino repairs the casino, is it not against.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand. In other words, the hon Member interpreted a previous answer to mean that one could only set off the development aid against profits from the asset to which the development aid related. So that if a company had an income stream from some other activity, it was not available to set off against those profits. He is now saying 'hang on, the casino is not a property developer and therefore it is not selling and setting off the development aid against the profits of the sale, it is setting them off against the profits from people playing on its gaming tables'. That is how it works when the development aid is to a company other than a property developer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, but given that there is one piece of legislation that provides for the granting of development aid, is this distinction made in the legislation? When I asked originally.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is quite unusual for there to be development aid for a non.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I assumed in my original question to the Government that in fact the answer that I have just been given on the casino is what was in fact the answer that applied to everybody and not the other one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is actually, I do not know if the hon Member knows or can think of any other cases, I am not personally aware, it is quite unusual for development aid to be granted other than in the context of a real estate development. But of course it is available because the Ordinance speaks I think of the economic and social interests of Gibraltar. At the end of the day the Casino has reached a stage which requires a large sum invested in it or it cannot continue, and the Government have to form a view, there are lots of jobs there, a lot of activity and they applied for development aid but it is quite unusual. Of course when it is given to somebody who is going to use the asset not to sell but to do his business in, which might have nothing to do with real estate, it always results in the aid being offsetable against an income stream which has nothing to do with asset sales, with real estate asset sales. So if we gave a different impression in the answer to the previous question, then that was the wrong impression to have given him.

**ORAL**

**NO. 254 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government say how often and on what dates the Committee that appraises and scores applications for EU funding has met in 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Objective 2 Appraisal Sub-Committee/Small Grant Scheme Committee has met on five occasions during 2005 on the following dates:

1. 21 January 2005
2. 14 February 2005
3. 23 February 2005
4. 1 April 2005
5. 18 April 2005

The Objective 3 Appraisal Sub-Committee has met on one occasion during 2005 on the 23 February 2005.

ORAL

NO. 255 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EU FUNDING**

What is the composition of the Committee that appraises and scores applications for EU funding?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

### **Schedule to Question 255**

There are 2 Committees that appraise and score applications for EU funding. Their composition is as follows:-

(1) Objective 2 Appraisal Sub-Group/Small Grant Scheme Committee:

Mr James Savignon	-	Chairman, DTI
Mr Jimmy Risso	-	Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce
Mr Ian Torilla	-	Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses
Mr Francis Martin	-	Environmental Agency
Mr Jason Davies	-	Secretary, DTI

(2) Objective 3 Appraisal Sub-Group:

Mr Charles Collinson	-	Chairman, DTI
Mr Jimmy Risso	-	Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce
Mr Ian Torilla	-	Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses
Mrs Giselle Catania	-	Department of Education and Training
Mrs V Gregory	-	Employment Service



**NO. 256 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Have the two parties who were under consideration for the receipt of EU funding in answer to Questions 1794 and 2380 of 2004 now submitted the additional information that was requested, and have these applications been successful or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The additional information requested from the two parties who were under consideration for the receipt of EU funding has not been forthcoming. The current status of these projects is as follows:-

1. SANDWICH BAR

The application is not being proceeded with by the applicants due to the fact that the firm in question closed down. The EU Unit was informed by the applicants that they did not wish to proceed with their application.

2. RISSO BAKERY

A new application is in the process of being submitted due to the fact that the material ownership of the sponsoring company has changed.

**NO. 257 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties that have applied for:

- a) EU funding or
- b) Gibraltar Government funding

since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purpose for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful, and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule attached.

**Schedule to Question 257**

**ESF PROJECTS**

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>ESF</b>	<b>GOG</b>	<b>Private Sector</b>	<b>Purpose of Project</b>
36	Business Management Programme 8	Department of Education & Training	Still Pending	£41,966 (45%)	£28,353 (30%)	£22,940 (25%)	Training scheme leading to a Post Graduate in Management
37	Vocational Training Scheme 5	Department of Education & Training	Still Pending	£1,757,030 (45%)	£2,147,484 (55%)		Scheme to improve access to the labour market for school leavers & young people (under the age of 25)

Both projects are awaiting approval by the Economic Committee

**Cont...**

**"Contd Schedule to Question 257**

**ERDF PROJECTS**

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>ERDF</b>	<b>GOG</b>	<b>Purpose of Grant</b>
72	Ministry for the, Environment, Roads & Utilities	Offer Letter withdrawn	£116,000	£116,000	Building & renovation works of permanent Bus Depot.
73	Catering Services Ltd	Approved	£3,755	£3,755	Renovation works, purchase of tables & chairs, & project management fees.
74	J B Engineering Consultants	Approved	£1,956	£1,956	Purchase of equipment, office furniture & Rent Subsidy Scheme
75	A M Capurro & Sons Ltd	Approved	£5,000	£5,000	Building works & purchase of equipment
76	Brugie Ltd T/A Trafalgar Pharmacy	Approved	£12,812	£12,812	Building works, project management fees, Rent & Rates Subsidy Scheme, purchase of clinical equipment & computer hardware & software, payment of Import Duty & marketing/advertising
77	Changes Hairdressing Salon	Approved	£735	£735	Purchase of hairdressing workstation, boiler & installation costs.
78	The Goldfish Bowl Ltd	Approved	£2,277	£2,277	Purchase of I.T & photographic equipment, renovation works, website set-up & advertising & Rent Subsidy Scheme
79	Rock Interactive	Approved	£5,000	£5,000	Rent Subsidy Scheme, building/renovation works, purchase of equipment & marketing
80	Turnbull Enterprise Ltd	Still Pending	£35,000	£35,000	Demolition, rebuilding & fitting out works, electrical works, promotion & set-up costs & the payment of professional services.

**Cont...**

**Contd Schedule to Question 257**

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT FUNDING**

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>Loan</b>	<b>Purpose of Funding</b>
70	The Gold Fishbowl Ltd	Approved	£2,500		Set-up of an artistic quality photographic studio
71	The Gibraltar Echo (Publishing) Ltd	Approved		£10,000	Set-up of a new independent daily newspaper
72	M H Bland & Co Ltd	Not Approved	£10,849		Installation of a multimedia audio & visual guide in the Upper Rock
73	Let's Go Ltd	Approved	£7,359		Refurbishment & installation of toilets at site at the entrance of World War II Tunnels

ORAL

**NO. 258 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

How much EU funding was obtained for the GIBMANATUR project with Morocco under Interreg IIIA and what was the amount?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of £48,500 of EU funding was obtained for the GIBMANATUR project with Morocco under Interreg IIIA.

**NO. 259 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERREG IIIB PROGRAMME**

Can Government say whether Gibraltar was directly involved in any of the 74 projects submitted for Interreg IIIB funding at the meeting that took place in Lisbon in March?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Gibraltar was directly involved in three of the 74 projects submitted for Interreg IIIB funding at the meeting that took place in Lisbon in early March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 259 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what these three projects were?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the first project was a project called ADMITRON II which is for the purchase of hardware and software to provide services using infrastructure set up under the Adminton 1 project. The ARQ. S.XX which is a study of modern architecture of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, basically led by the Town Planning Department, and Aqua Control which was led by AquaGib which is the creation of an indicator system common to the whole of the SUDOE area which enables the sustainable and efficient management of the existing hydric resources.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say how much funding was obtained in relation to each of these three projects?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

All three projects have successfully obtained funding. The ADMITRON II has an EU funding of 90,000 Euros. The ARQ. S.XX has 20,000 Euros and the Aqua Control has 49,000 Euros.

ORAL

**NO. 260 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERREG IIIB PROGRAMME**

Can Government say whether Gibraltar was represented at the meeting in Lisbon at the beginning of March of the committee organising the Interreg IIIB initiative for South East Europe?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Gibraltar was represented at the Interreg IIIB (SUDOE) meeting in Lisbon at the beginning of March 2005 by Mr Douglas Ryan, the Gibraltar Interreg Programme Co-Ordinator.



ORAL

**NO. 261 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the E-Business Advisory Council met since 7 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 262 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 262 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUSINESS AND COMMERCE ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Business Advisory Council met since 3 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Business and Commerce Advisory Council met once since the 3 December 2004 on the 17 February 2005.

The E-business Advisory Council met once since 7 December 2004 on 3 February 2005.

**NO. 263 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored in Gibraltar since 17 November 2004, showing the dates of the conferences in question, the cost, and the department that was most directly involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Conferences that the Government has assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored in Gibraltar since 17 November 2004, are as follows:-

1. Wednesday 29 September 2004, Gibraltar Bankers' Association annual conference, Caleta Hotel. James Tipping, Joe Macano and Guy Canessa attended. No cost involved.
2. Tuesday 16 November 2004, Willis Insurance Seminar, Ten Trinity Square (Willis Ltd's London office) – presentation by Finance Centre Director on "EU regulation/Gibraltar business environment". No cost involved except for the Finance Centre Director's transportation and accommodation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 263 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say, there was no cost in relation to the first conference and there was a cost in relation to the second one. Does he have what the cost is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I am afraid I do not have the information available. There was no cost in respect of the conference but I have not got the information in respect of the Finance Centre Director's transportation and accommodation.

ORAL

**NO. 264 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MINISTER’S OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister with responsibility for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business since 10 December 2004 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Since 10 December 2004 I have been away from Gibraltar on Government business as follows:-

26-27 January 2005 – FITUR – Madrid

7-8 March 2005 – Brighton Road Show – Brighton.

ORAL

**NO. 265 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – NEW YEAR CELEBRATIONS**

Can Government say whether the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates went to the lowest bidder?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 266 and 267 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 266 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – NEW YEAR CELEBRATIONS**

Can Government say whether the successful tenderer for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates was the tenderer chosen by the Treasury Tender Board?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 265 and 267 of 2005.

**NO. 267 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – NEW YEAR CELEBRATIONS**

Can Government list the parties who submitted a tender for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates, showing the amount bid by each?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The tender for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates did not go to the lowest bidder. As the hon Member knows, Government tenders clearly state that the Government do not commit themselves to accept the lowest tender.

The following parties submitted a tender for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates:-

Fastrite	£44,750
The Studio	£59,650
Word of Mouth Concert Promoters	£61,100
Andalucian Music Company	£23,700

The tender was not awarded to the bidder recommended by the Treasury Tender Board.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 265 TO 267 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say which bidder was recommended by the Treasury Tender Board?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The recommendation was Fastrite in £44,750.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say why the tender was not awarded to the person they recommended?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The contents of the proposal, in the light of the fact that this was the last event of the Tercentenary, was felt to have been better represented by the proposal put forward by The Studio. I think I have explained this already to the hon Member in this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let me just clarify for the hon Member generally not in specific to this tender. It is not the rule that Government tenders are always awarded as recommended by the Treasury Tender Board. It is most unusual for Ministers to displace the judgement of the Treasury Tender Board where the tender is simply a question of money, so all else is equal and it is just a question of who is the cheapest or who offers the best value for money. In other words, where the criteria for determining the winner the public interest is served by simply using money, cost, it is most unusual for Ministers to interfere with the Treasury Tender Board recommendations. But even in those circumstances it is possible to interfere for example, where the lowest tenderer owes a huge amount of Government arrears or has what we regard as a disproportionate level of resident employees. That does happen from time to time, the Government do have policies which are usually known to the Treasury Tender Board and usually they implement it, but even in those circumstances for reasons such as that, Ministers can displace the judgement of the Treasury Tender Board even when the thing just relates to money, unusual but possible. When the tender is for something that has content and is not just money, for example the design of a stamp, or the design of a building, something that is a question of taste or judgement or the content of a musical concert, or the Government puts out a tender for the design of a fountain, at the end of the day Ministers are not going to allow the three Civil Servants that happen to be on the Tender Board to decide what is the design that should go up, and Ministers often and in those circumstances usually the judgement is made by Ministers and not by Treasury Tender Board. So I think it is important because it is very easy to run away with the idea that the Treasury Tender Board's recommendations or decision necessarily always should and is accepted. In most cases, in the vast, vast majority of cases that is the case but there are also quite a lot of cases in which it is not.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My next supplementary was going to be if the Treasury Tender Board did not allocate the tender then who allocates it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only Ministers have the authority to accept or not accept the recommendations of the Treasury Tender Board. So there are some tenders which are never looked at by the Treasury Tender Board, so when the tender has a design element, as I expressed before, it does not go to Treasury Tender Board at all, it goes to a committee of relevant Ministers. But there is not any official who can refuse the recommendation of the Treasury Tender Board, it has to be Ministers.



**NO. 268 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOURISM WORKSHOPS**

On what date will the Gibraltar Tourist Board be holding tourism workshops in Madrid and Barcelona and on what basis will the Mancomunidad be able to promote its tourism products there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

In Madrid on 20 April, which has already taken place and in Barcelona on 8 June 2005.

The Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar will have their own exhibition table at these events.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 268 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Mancomunidad actually pay anything or contribute anything for having this stand or this table as part of the stand?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, they are being treated like local operators actually are able to do so. In other words, we hire the facility as a Tourist Board and we allow local operators to have their own displays and their own sort of little stands, in order for them to be able to establish commercial contact with operators in Madrid, and they have their own little table as well and stand trying to sell their wares as well.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do the Government not accept that there is a difference between a local operator exhibiting in a tourism stand and the Mancomunidad exhibiting in a Gibraltar tourism stand, in the sense that the local operator will be attracting business to Gibraltar and to their businesses? Surely the aim of the Mancomunidad presence is to attract business or tourists to go and visit them and stay in their hotels and eat in their restaurants et cetera. Do the Government accept that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Their focus is very much trying to attract visitors to the region and obviously if they can establish contact with Madrid operators that will actually be able to bring people to the region, it will obviously benefit Gibraltar in the same way as it benefits them. They recognise that Gibraltar is really the magnet in the area to bring visitors down here and therefore they jump on the bandwagon to try and benefit from that. Obviously they will not be doing that on their own but they realise that if they did that on their own, the attraction will be much, much less.

ORAL

**NO. 269 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SUB-COMMITTEE ON TOURISM**

Can Government list the members of the sub-committee on tourism that has been created with the Mancomunidad?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr Peter Canessa and Mr Nicky Guerrero representing the Gibraltar Tourist Board, and Inmaculada Ruiz and Myriam Jimenez representing the Mancomunidad de Municipios.

ORAL

**NO. 270 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – INFORMATION PATROL OFFICERS**

How many persons applied for the posts of Seasonal Temporary Visitor Information Patrol Officers that were advertised on 31 March 2005 and how many posts were vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 272 and 274 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 271 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GTB – BEACH FACILITIES**

Can Government confirm that full facilities will be available at all beaches for the official bathing season?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 271 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the Minister please note that I was recently approached by a resident of Both Worlds who complained to me about the amount of rubbish at Sandy Bay last weekend, could he have the matter investigated and take whatever remedial action he considers pertinent?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I will look into it.

ORAL

**NO. 272 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – BEACH LIFEGUARDS**

How many persons applied for the posts of Beach Lifeguard that were advertised on 31 March 2005 and how many posts were vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 270 and 274 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 273 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR**

How did the vacancy which was advertised for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator in the Gibraltar office in Madrid come about?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The holder of the post resigned and moved to Greece to further her career.

**NO. 274 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR**

How many persons applied for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator at the Gibraltar Office in Madrid that was advertised in March and has anyone been selected for the post?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**Answer to Question No. 270**

There are 12 vacancies for Temporary Seasonal Visitor Information Patrol Officers, and 58 persons applied. The successful candidates will be taking up employment on 4 July 2005. Selection will not take place until the first week in June.

**Answer to Question No. 272**

There were 44 persons that applied for the Lifeguard vacancies and there are 28 vacancies for this post. The successful candidates will not be taking up employment until the commencement of the Summer Bathing Season on the 11 June 2005. Selection will not take place until the last week in May.

**Answer to Question No. 274**

Six persons applied for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator at the Gibraltar Office in Madrid. Five persons were short-listed for interview, one person withdrew the application, no one was found suitable and the vacancy will be re-advertised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 270, 272 AND 274 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible to say why it was that of the five who were short-listed nobody was found suitable for this job?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe that none of the candidates had the suitable marketing experience or qualification for that matter to take up the post. Therefore the Board decided not to nominate any of the applicants.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The actual advert which invited the applicants who were interested in this post mentions a degree in marketing and experience in the field of tourism and/or marketing, is it that nobody had any of those qualifications at all? If they did not, why were they short-listed in the first place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not aware of the details to be honest. The only thing that I know is that of the four that were finally interviewed, none of them were found to be suitable. Whether they actually had the qualifications I would assume they have if they were short-listed but I assume that they did not feel that they had the relevant experience in tourism for that matter.

**HON DR J J GARCIA**

Can the Minister say whether these were actually Gibraltar people resident in Gibraltar or whether the people who applied were resident in Madrid or somewhere else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe three of them were local, four of them were local but three of them were resident in Gibraltar and I believe one of them was already resident in Madrid.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was the person resident in Madrid, was this somebody else employed by the Government in that same office in Madrid or was it someone else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.

**ORAL**

**NO. 275 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from December 2004 inclusive:

- a) by charging coaches that use the coach park;
- b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock;
- c) in admissions to the Gibraltar Museum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule attached.

## Schedule to Question 275

The revenue raised on a monthly basis from December 2004 inclusive is as follows:-

### (a) Coach Park

	£
<b>December 2004</b>	4,480.00
<b>January 2005</b>	3,500.00
<b>February 2005</b>	5,020.00
<b>March 2005</b>	7,130.00

### (b) Upper Rock

	£
<b>December 2004</b>	88,470.85
<b>January 2005</b>	86,226.50
<b>February 2005</b>	96,982.10
<b>March 2005</b>	157,720.75

### (c) Gibraltar Museum

	£
<b>December 2004</b>	668.60
<b>January 2005</b>	1,041.20
<b>February 2005</b>	1,079.52
<b>March 2005</b>	1,886.87

**NO. 276 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said:

- a) that they had not stayed at a hotel;
- b) that they had stayed at a hotel;

since November 2004 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location and in the case of those who stayed in hotels what was the average length of stay in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

**Schedule to Question 276**

**Place of Interview  
Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel**

	Total Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Port	Frontier	Waterport	Marina	Coach Park
Nov 04	1,506	44	1	1,286	-	8	167
Dec 04	1,496	29	1	1,317	1	-	148
Jan 05	1,495	11	1	1,365	-	3	115

**Place of Interview  
Number of Interviews Stayed at Hotel**

	Total No of Interviews	Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Average Length of Stay	Frontier	Average Length of Stay	Elsewhere	Average Length of Stay
Nov 04	1,524	18	16	5.8	2	3.2	-	-
Dec 04	1,506	10	9	4.9	1	1.0	-	-
Jan 05	1,507	12	12	6.4	-	-	-	-

The figures for February and March 2005 will be available shortly.

**NO. 277 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

Can Government say what amounts are due and owing to Government in respect of loans under the Hotel Assistance Scheme, listing the hotels in question and the amounts repaid as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There are no amounts due and owing to Government in respect of loans issued under the Hotel Assistance Scheme as at 31 March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 277 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that because the loans have been repaid in full or because the Government have decided to reschedule the amounts, for what reason?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Government early this year considered the possibility of reaching an agreement with a local bank in order to take over these loans from the Government. An agreement was reached and these loans were repaid to Government in full. However, there was a difference between the interest being paid by the hotels to the Government which was based at base rate and those that were agreed with the local bank at 0.75 per cent, and the Government decided that they would pay the difference in that interest over the period of the loan over the amount left and the Government was paid in full for the loans that were owing by the local hoteliers. The interest difference resulted from the amount owed to us by the hotel.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister firstly what bank it was, and secondly how much this differential in terms of the rate of interest that hotels are now paying which the Government have paid, what does that come to in pounds and pence?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The bank involved was Barclays Bank plc, and the difference that we are talking about was £85,862.94.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure the hon Member has got the gist of that. The other sum that was due was £2. something million or £3. something million was due but it was due by people who had an agreement that had some time left to go and they were paying interest rate at base. We invited them to refinance themselves so that the capital would be released to the Government to be reinvested, but of course we had to somehow compensate them for the fact that they had to go and finance themselves at a higher rate. That differential in interest rate was capitalised, in other words, the net present value of that payment was capitalised and that capitalised sum was deducted from the amount of capital that they were obliged to repay, resulting in a capital discount of £80 odd thousand. See what I mean, but it is a capitalised value of the forward interest rate differential. So the amount of capital repaid was the amount of capital outstanding on the loans minus this sum to reflect the net present value of the increased interest rates that they had to pay the bank over and above what they were paying the Government.

ORAL

**NO. 278 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Council met since 26 November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Tourism Advisory Council has met once since 26 November 2004, on the 24<sup>th</sup> February 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 279 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How much of the 2004/2005 £980,000 Tourism budget for Marketing, Promotions and Conferences has been spent as at 31 March 2005, giving a breakdown of the expenditure in question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Schedule to Question 279**

<b>Marketing, Promotions &amp; Advertising</b>	<b>£</b>
Literature	91,532.77
Activity (Trade)	21,275.09
Activity (Media)	15,848.01
Promotional Material	3,610.41
Advertising	346,818.91
Trade Fairs	39,444.04
Website	7,537.81
Recurrent Expenditure	127,067.98
Activity (Media)	6,872.85
Events	204,562.05
Contingencies	40,689.31
Trade Consumer Fairs	36,927.41
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>942,186.64</b>

**NO. 280 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – IBERRAIL**

Have there been any results from the discussions between the Government and Iberrail for the development of rail packages to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes. Iberrail has included Gibraltar in their package.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 280 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister, obviously the question was submitted to the House before the Government release had come out, when the tourists arrive at Algeciras from Ciudad Real or from Madrid, what is the procedure to bring them from Algeciras to Gibraltar and is that included as part of the rates that they pay?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

They have to make their own way from Algeciras to Gibraltar. Alternatively, as part of an option on the package, they are able to obtain car rental within the package which then means that they have a car available during their period here.

ORAL

**NO. 281 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – CANCELLED FLIGHTS**

How many flights between Gibraltar and the following airports were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis to or from:

- a) London Gatwick;
- b) London Heathrow;
- c) London Luton;
- d) Manchester;

since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule which I hand over.

**Schedule to Question 281****(a) Flights from/to London Gatwick**

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 52 To 52	Cancelled 8 Cancelled 8
January 2005	From 39 To 39	Cancelled 1 Cancelled 1
February 2005	From 27 To 27	Cancelled 3 Cancelled 1
March 2005	From 31 To 31	

**(b) Flights from/to London Heathrow**

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 0 To 0	
January 2005	From 21 To 21	Cancelled 1 Cancelled 1
February 2005	From 25 To 25	Cancelled 3 Cancelled 3
March 2005	From 31 To 31	

**(c) Flights from/to London Luton**

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 23 To 23	
January 2005	From 22 To 22	
February 2005	From 20 To 20	
March 2005	From 22 To 22	

**(d) Flights from/to Manchester**

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 16 To 16	Cancelled 2 Cancelled 2
January 2005	From 15 To 15	Cancelled 3 Cancelled 3
February 2005	From 16 To 16	
March 2005	From 17 To 17	

**NO. 282 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FLIGHT PLANS**

Can Government say whether any Gibraltar-bound flight has:

- a) been diverted to a Spanish airport;
- b) been allowed to enter a Spanish airport as an alternative when filing its flight plan;

since 3 December 2004, and if so on what dates did this happen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Eight flights have been diverted to a Spanish airport on the following dates:

9<sup>th</sup> February 2005 – 1 flight  
27<sup>th</sup> February 2005 – 2 flights  
28<sup>th</sup> February 2005 – 4 flights  
1<sup>st</sup> March 2005 – 1 flight.

Since 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2004, every single flight from a UK airport to Gibraltar enters Malaga as its diversion airport when filing their flight plan.

**NO. 283 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – AIRLINES**

Can Government say with how many airlines interested in flying to Gibraltar it is in discussion with at present?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Two.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 283 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government able to give the names of those airlines?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Considering that there have been some reports in the press of late, EasyJet and Thomson Flying.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister will recall the number of times I have requested the names of airlines across the floor of this House to be told that this is commercially sensitive and this information cannot be disclosed to the Opposition or indeed in public, so imagine the surprise when the names of these two airlines were disclosed at a tourist event in Madrid. Can the Minister say whether this is a new policy on the part of the Government and now whenever we ask the names of airlines these will now be disclosed to the Opposition?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There had not been a change of policy, what actually happened was that a member of staff in the Madrid office was speaking to somebody in the local office and somebody overheard the conversation that happened to be a journalist that

subsequently published it. That was picked up by the local media and reported locally. That was unfortunate.



**NO. 284 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – AIR TERMINAL**

What procedures are in place to provide electricity power back-up at the Air Terminal in the event of a power cut?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There are none at present, Government are currently considering various options to address the situation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 284 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister therefore saying that when there is a power cut in the evening or when the night flight is expected or has arrived, passengers are actually in the air terminal in pitch dark, in complete darkness?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, we may have that sort of situation, in fact it has happened of late on a couple of occasions. We are looking at ways to remedy this now.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case that this emergency power back up or emergency lighting has actually never existed at the air terminal, or has it been in place before and been withdrawn?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No there has never been emergency lighting at the terminal. It is something that I believe should be addressed and will be addressed.

**NO. 285 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

How many Spanish operators met with the GTB during FITUR this year to progress discussions on the development of Gibraltar holiday packages and who were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The GTB met with Iberrail to progress discussions on their Gibraltar holiday packages.

New contacts were made with the following entities:-

Barcelo Viajes  
Viajes Iberia  
Livingstur

In addition, most of the agents and operators that visit the Gibraltar Stand at FITUR speak to Gibraltar operators and do business with them directly and therefore not the function of the Tourist Board as such.

ORAL

**NO. 286 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

What was the cost of the dinner hosted by the Minister responsible for Tourism for a number of Spanish travel journalists on the eve of FITUR in Madrid, how many journalists attended and what media did they represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Schedule to Question 286**

The cost of the dinner was £1,404.72.

**Fitur Dinner 2005 - Journalists**

P Dalmases	Radio Nacional de Espana
M Melchi	Mas Viajes Magazine
M F Fernandez	Turismo Aereo Y Transporte Magazine
V Rodrigo	Airclasse Magazine
J L Gonzalez Salgado	Convenciones Y Incentivos Magazine
Angel Mas	Diario Metro Magazine
M Tello	Hosteltur Magazine
M Moran	IH Magazines
A Olea	Lunas de Miel Magazine
M V de Rojas	Ejecutivos Magazine
M Rinon	Escapada Magazine
N Ros	Editur Magazine
C Arregui	Viajeros Magazine
E Villar	Canal Viajar
R Navarro	Canal Viajar
A Santa Cruz	Turismo Y Aventura Magazine
M Cascajares	La Vanguardia
J L Yague	La Tribuna
A Florez	Turismo Aereo Y Transporte Magazine
M Ramos	Aviacion Y Turismo Magazine
J De Lucas	The Tourist Magazine
A Falco	Periodico de Catalunya
E Garcia	Hoteles de Espana & Del Mundo Magazine

**NO. 287 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

Can Government say how many persons formed part of the official Gibraltar delegation to FITUR and indicate what posts they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr Peter Canessa, Chief Executive, Gibraltar Tourist Board and myself visited FITUR on the 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> January.

The delegation composed of:

Mr Nicky Guerrero	-	Sales and Marketing Manager
Mr Dylan Ferrer	-	Sales and Marketing Co-ordinator
Ms Gloria Macedo	-	Sales and Marketing Assistant
Ms Denise Devincenzi	-	Sales and Marketing – Madrid Office
Ms Gillaine de los Santos	-	Sales and Marketing – Madrid Office

ORAL

**NO. 288 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

What was the cost with a breakdown of Gibraltar's participation in FITUR from 26-30 January 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Schedule to Question 288**

	<u>£</u>
Travel Expenses	940.91
Air Passage	842.80
Photo and Video	500.83
Stand	15,670.44
Literature Transport	247.90
Overtime	997.29
Subsistence	2,492.75
Posters	480.00
Accommodation	600.10
Giveaways	2,347.90
Miscellaneous	317.96
	-----
TOTAL:	£25,438.88

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 288 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister clarify, does the £2,492 for subsistence include the £1,400 of the dinner for journalists or is that shown somewhere else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, that is a separate cost this is not included in the FITUR analysis that I have just handed over to him. Subsistence is basically subsistence to staff.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would it be correct then to say that the total cost of FITUR would have been the £25,438 plus £1,400 for the journalists?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct although the dinner is coincidental on FITUR and not part of FITUR.



**NO. 289 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

Can Government confirm whether the Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar made use jointly of the Gibraltar Government stand at FITUR this year, and if so tell the House exactly what that entailed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar did not jointly use the GTB stand at FITUR. Representatives from the Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar visited the stand and Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar literature was displayed at the stand.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 289 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the Mancomunidad had their own stand and that is why there was nobody in the Gibraltar stand, and did they include their exhibition literature on other stands as well or only on the Gibraltar one?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Mancomunidad had their own stand in which the different municipalities had their own sort of desk. The Municipio had their own literature on our stand but they did not have a stand on their own as such.

**NO. 290 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – UKGTA**

What was the cost with a breakdown of holding the UKGTA meeting in Gibraltar in January 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The cost of holding the UKGTA meeting in Gibraltar in January 2005 is as follows:-

Air fare for Mr Ian Lomas, Cresta	£41.16
Airport taxes for 5 people	£95.40
London Office staff expenses	£68.40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£240.96</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 290 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am not sure I heard the Minister correctly, the air far was £41.16 in relation to one person, is that right?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That was correct. I do not know why that air ticket has actually been paid, I have not been able to follow that up but it is normal for the airlines to offer free passages to members. When we have the UKGTA meetings in the UK, which is at least three times a year, we all travel to the UK free of charge and we pay for our hotel accommodation with those coming in this direction enjoying the same privilege of flights and I believe even hotels.

**NO. 291 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SMALL POCKET CALENDARS**

Can Government say whether the Gibraltar Tourist Board has published small pocket calendars and if so at what cost and where were they printed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes, they were printed by Analgo in Spain at a cost of £870.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 291 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether this was a competitive tender and they happened to be the cheapest or what was the decision?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I think one has to understand that we cannot go out to tender in a place like Madrid for example, for £870, nobody would respond to this. What they do is that they seek at least three quotes from different entities in order to make sure that we get value for money and then select a tender. The value of this sort of work is not worth the bother.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm that the distribution of these calendars is actually in Madrid, or in Spain or where exactly are they being distributed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These calendars are given to the trade when for example, our Marketing Manager visits travel agents or operators or whatever, she carries bags full of them and gives them around with the hope that they will stick them on to their computer and have a reminder of Gibraltar and our telephone numbers et cetera.

ORAL

**NO. 292 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MISS GIBRALTAR**

Can Government say whether the tender award of £19,750 to Stage One Productions for the Organisation, Production and Staging of the Miss Gibraltar 2005 contest was the highest bid of the three received?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No, it was the lowest bid of the three received.

ORAL

**NO. 293 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARITIME MUSEUM**

Can Government say whether they have been approached to help set up a maritime museum in Gibraltar and can they say what locations are envisaged for this project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government have not been approached with any formal proposal.

**NO. 294 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – DUTY FREE SALES**

What is the procedure currently in place for Main Street businesses who wish to make duty free sales to clients coming into Gibraltar overland and leaving across the border?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Duty Free Sales can only be made by those businesses that hold a Private Bonded Store (PBS).

The procedure currently in place is that the client makes the purchase, the Private Bonded Stores Operator prepares an export declaration and accompanies the client to Customs Station at Four Corners where the goods are checked, the declaration signed and the export supervised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 294 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The reason for tabling the question was representations made by some traders in relation to the actual process being rather cumbersome and that it involves the trader going with the client to the Customs with the goods and I am then not quite sure how the duty free side of it works, but their complaint was that many clients were reluctant to do this and felt almost as if they were doing something weird or wrong by going.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is the traders who are policing not the clients.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government satisfied with the way in which this procedure is working?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, remember it is a very unique procedure. It is not normal anywhere in the world for there to be any duty free facility on the high street over a land frontier. I mean there is a procedure for a refund, as many Gibraltarians do when they are exiting Spain, one can get paperwork, get a refund and eventually it would be possible I suppose to mount a system like that but it would be quite cumbersome really and require a huge amount of paperwork and administration. So, short of some self-policing system, which I think would be open to potential and easy abuse by people, this is the only way that the administration has thought of of enabling the facility to exist without there being a huge risk to the integrity of the duty system. If it can be refined somehow in a way that still does not make it easier to abuse, the Government would consider it.

ORAL

**NO. 295 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ROADSHOW IN BRIGHTON**

What was the cost of the dinner hosted for selected guests at the GTB roadshow in Brighton in March, and can Government list those who attended?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.



**Schedule to Question 295**

The cost of the dinner including the room hire was £6,780.11.

**Attendees at the GTB Brighton Roadshow**

NAME	SURNAME	TRAVEL AGENT
Susanne	Grinstead	Adur Travel
Alison	Kelsey	Adur Travel
Mia	Pooley	Adur Travel
Laura	Caley	American Express Europe Ltd
Lorna	Hills	American Express Europe Ltd
Dawn	Steele	American Express Europe Ltd
Jeni	Stevens	American Express Europe Ltd
Laura	Taylor	American Express Europe Ltd
Tracey	Wainwright	American Express Europe Ltd
Jonathan	Gayle	American Express Europe Ltd
Candy	Homewood	American Express Europe Ltd
Samantha	Ingle	American Express Europe Ltd
Samantha	Eden	American Express Europe Ltd
Judith	Faulds	American Express Europe Ltd
Keith	Gough	American Express Europe Ltd
Ian	Warwick	American Express Europe Ltd
Carole	Stanton	Aossa Travel
Jane	Bounds	Aossa Travel
Zusanna	Gombarova	Aossa Travel
Mrs A	Reed	Bargain Travel Bureau Ltd
Gary	Willis	Bargain Travel Bureau Ltd
Jason	Donald	Bargain Travel Bureau Ltd
Roger	Mallock	Bath Travel
Karen	Heath	Beacon Travel Service
Sarah	Keel	Beacon Travel Service
Sheila	Williams	Beacon Travel Service
Catherine	Cooper	Chillout Events Ltd
Jack	Cooper	Chillout Events Ltd
David	Drew	Chillout Events Ltd
Patricia	Redmann	Chillout Events Ltd
Jospeh	Leonard	Cruising in Style Travel
Kevin	Moran	Cruising in Style Travel
Lawrence	Patterson	Cruising in Style Travel
Jane	Hollobone	Eclipse Travel Office
Julie	Humphries	Eclipse Travel Office
Claire	Johnson	Eclipse Travel Office
Laura	Alpon	First Choice Travel Shop
Karen	Audhley	First Choice Travel Shop
Louise	Cooper	First Choice Travel Shop
Dawna	Smith	First Choice Travel Shop
Claire	Wallis	First Choice Travel Shop
Cherie	Dooley	First Choice Travel Shop
Rebecca	Gibbons	First Choice Travel Shop
Hannah	Paino	First Choice Travel Shop

Cont...

**"Contd" Schedule to Question 295**

Tracey	Weller	First Choice Travel Shop
Jess	Combe	Flight Centre (UK) Ltd
Ana	Dunham	Flight Centre (UK) Ltd
Pauline	Sayer	Global Travel (Worthing)
David	Sayer	Global Travel (Worthing)
Sharon	Smith	Global Travel (Worthing)
Ian	Carr	Haywards Travel Ltd
Janice	Chapman	Haywards Travel Ltd
Shereen	Haylock	Haywards Travel Ltd
Vicky	Morten	Haywards Travel Ltd
Lisa	Radkin	Haywards Travel Ltd
Jacqueline	Bardsley	Holiday Shop
Louise	Gregory	Holiday Shop
Marcella	Miron	Holiday Shop
Tracy	Warren	Holiday Shop
Sandra	Bachram	John Proctor Travel
Sharon	Hollingsdale	John Proctor Travel
Julia	Lauren	John Proctor Travel
Zoe	Lower	John Proctor Travel
Sharon	Morgan	John Proctor Travel
Nicky	Bicknell	La Manga by Design Ltd
Zoe	Boniface	La Manga by Design Ltd
Elaine	Kerr	La Manga by Design Ltd
Joe	Ball	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Ian	Butters	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Lutz	Ehrich	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Robert	Phillips	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Tony	Prcas	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Michelle	Potter	Meon Valley Travel
Jill	Tibbets	Meon Valley Travel
Ben	Cook	Panorama Holiday Group Ltd
Karla	Earp	Panorama Holiday Group Ltd
John	Farrugia	Panorama Holiday Group Ltd
Paul	Andrews	Personal Service Travel
Vivien	Leigh	Personal Service Travel
Mark	Thorogood	Personal Service Travel
Yvonne	Evenden	Personal Service Travel
Gay	Hawgood	Personal Service Travel
Geraldine	Noatshlo	Personal Service Travel
Pat	Arrowsmith	Personal Service Travel
Paul	Hopwood	Personal Service Travel
Angela	Merrick	Personal Service Travel
G	Bell	Rutherfords Travel
S	Bell	Rutherfords Travel
Trevor	Bones	Southern Cross Travel
Penny	Tedham	Southern Cross Travel
Melanie	Krolick	STS Schools Travel
Leanne	Ramsden	STS Schools Travel
Ilaria	Sassi	STS Schools Travel
Marie	Appleton	Thomas Cook Ltd
Sarah	King	Thomas Cook Ltd

Cont.....

**"Contd" Schedule to Question 295**

Chris	Reid	Thomas Cook Ltd
Nicola	Tinnuche	Thomas Cook Ltd
Annemarie	Boyd	Thomas Cook Ltd
Scarlett	Chocker	Thomas Cook Ltd
Debbie	Lewis	Thomas Cook Ltd
Karen	Richardson	Thomas Cook Ltd
Gemma	Shepard	Thomas Cook Ltd
Nigel	Simon	Thomas Cook Ltd
Janet	Walsh	Thomas Cook Ltd
Lara	Harris	Thomas Cook Ltd
Karen	Speirs	Thomas Cook Ltd
Amy	Baines	Thomas Cook Ltd
Francesca	Baulding	Thomas Cook Ltd
Janette	Romaniuk	Thomas Cook Ltd
Rebecca	Thrift	Thomas Cook Ltd
Kerry	Arnold	Thomson Retail
Corry	Cluch	Thomson Retail
Leanne	Grant	Thomson Retail
Michelle	Hurtham	Thomson Retail
Louise	Roberts	Thomson Retail
Joe	Seynan	Thomson Retail
Angie	Smith	Thomson Retail
Sophie	Dean	Thomson Retail
Lian	Oliver	Thomson Retail
Naomi	Starbrown	Thomson Retail
Carla		Thomson Retail
Donna		Thomson Retail
Lynn		Thomson Retail
Karen	Burt	Thomson Retail
Caroline	Finbow	Thomson Retail
Caroline	Ratray	Thomson Retail
Christine	Dobson	Touchdown
Alan	Forbes	Touchdown
Sharon	Jones	Touchdown
Janet	Sherwood	Touchdown
Natasha	Steele	Touchdown
Karen	Uden	Touchdown
Lilly	Waite	Touchdown
Joanna	Farr	Travel Counselers/Home Workers
Sue	Verall	Travel Counselers/Home Workers
Julie	Burton	Travelcare
Stephanie	Dyer	Travelcare
Chris	Hurcombe	Travelcare
Trevor	Ridler	Travelcare
Rosa	Flores	Travelcare
Charlotte	Hanbin	Travelcare
Julia	Smith	Travelcare
Donna	Sullivan	Travelcare
Shirley	Waters	Travelcare
Nicola	Charles	Worldhoppers Ltd

Cont...

**"Contd" Schedule to Question 295**

Charlotte	Emerton	Worldhoppers Ltd
Holly	Goulson	Worldhoppers Ltd
Shirley	Martin	Worldhoppers Ltd
Kelly	Ruthven	Worldhoppers Ltd

ORAL

**NO. 296 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ROADSHOW IN BRIGHTON**

How many of the over 150 travel agents and representatives of the UK media accepted the invitation to the GTB roadshow in Brighton and actually attended?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 150 travel agents and representatives of the UK media attended the Brighton Roadshow.

ORAL

NO. 297 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – ROADSHOW IN BRIGHTON**

What was the cost with a breakdown of the GTB roadshow in Brighton in March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

**Schedule to Question 297**

**Breakdown of the GTB Roadshow in Brighton in March 2005**

	<b>£</b>
200 invitations printed	446.50
145 dinner menus	5,957.61
5 sandwich lunches	27.91
Room hire	822.50
Hotel accommodation	814.18
Photocopying	74.41
London Office staff expenses	41.20
150 silver plated key rings	1,099.50
Print and fill 15x6 helium balloons	234.00
Visual and sound system	1,307.19
Invitations	446.60
Accommodation and expenses for Minister	237.43
Travel/flights/travel for GTB staff	382.10
GTB staff expenses	117.96
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,009.11</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 297 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The answer handed to me by the Minister says that there were 145 dinner menus and that this cost nearly £6,000 which works out at about £41 per person. Can I ask the Minister what the menu was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well at £41 not very much. No we are talking about a buffet dinner where there was a spread of different options and when inviting such a cross section of people one has to take care for vegetarians and people who do not eat certain foods et cetera so that is what they got.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister where it was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

In the hotel where we had the presentation, I am not sure which hotel it was. I arrived there at night and got out very early in the morning, one of the seafront hotels in Brighton where they have the party conferences, I think it was the Metropole.



**NO. 298 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – BONDED STORES**

Can Government say how and on what date the Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce and the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses were consulted in its review of bonded stores facilities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Issues relating to bonded stores have been discussed at meetings of the Business Advisory Council and e-Business Advisory Council at which persons who belong to the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Small Businesses have been present. Although their membership of these Councils is in a personal capacity, they are nevertheless able to reflect the views of both of these trade organisations.

There have been no formal discussions on the matter with either the Chamber or the Federation with me as yet. However, I understand that discussions were held with my predecessor.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 298 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister will recall that we had some correspondence on the question of bonded stores in that those traders who do not have one and who want one feel aggrieved because the whole process has been frozen for some time and no new licences or whatever have been issued. In his letter to me which was an open letter and was not confidential or anything, the Minister refers that as part of the review there has been full consultation with the Chamber of Commerce and the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses, is it that there has not been any formal consultation with either of those two?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government have consulted the Chamber and the Federation but it was done by my predecessor not by myself. I have taken over the process which entails the possible changes and options that are open to us in this respect so consultation has taken place but not with me, that is why I say in my answer that I understand that discussions were held with my predecessor and I have taken those on board. These

views have been updated by members who actually sit on these Councils where the issue of bonded stores have been discussed openly with the various members and their views have been taken on board as an update of what was said at the time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has said that this obviously were issues which his predecessor had raised with the Chamber and with the FSB and in our own correspondence I was led to understand that the existing review is expected to take a further six months, can the Minister say how long this has been going on for, and for how long have no new facilities been made available?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would say that possibly for at least nine months before the last General Election, this topic was already on the radar screen for discussion with the Chamber and the Federation by my predecessor and it was an issue that has been brought forward for me to deal with.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The issue that arises here is obviously the question of unfair competition, the traders who do not have it feel that those traders who do have an edge over them and whilst this review goes on, the situation is obviously one where they feel they are losing out. Can the Minister give a clearer indication as to when he expects this review to be finalised so that new licences or new facilities can be made available to traders who may want it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member should not assume that the conclusion of the review will result in new licences being issuable. The results of the review may be the opposite.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does that mean revoking existing licences from those who have them or does it mean freezing things where they are? Obviously the review can have several conclusions at this stage.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

One does not need a review just to carry on operating the same system and issuing more licences on the same basis.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

No but given that it has been going on for so long perhaps could the Government add some urgency to their review and come to a conclusion so that traders know where they are?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the review as to the conditions that should apply or is the review as to whether more people should enjoy the benefits of the system?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a review about the extent to which the present system is capable of causing loss of revenue for the Government, about whether the risks of that outweigh or are outweighed by the benefits to trade, that sort of thing. Remember this is in effect self-policing, because although theoretically Customs do audits, at the end of the day these are not bonded stores like the good old days in Queens Stores, this is in the back of ones shop on Main Street, one has a pile of bottles of this or boxes of that and at the end of the day it is really a self-policing system. It is open to abuse because frankly the Government do not devote the resources to policing it that it would have to devote to it in order to, so we are reviewing which is not to say that the review is going to conclude one thing or the other but that is the nature of the review, once and for all to have a look at this to see what are the benefits to trade and do those benefits justify the dangers in the system.

ORAL

**NO. 299 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SECURITY**

Following increased security measures at the Port, can Government say what documents are required to be produced by non-resident anglers who want to fish from the North Mole?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 300 of 2005.

**NO. 300 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SECURITY**

Following increased security measures at the Port, can Government say what documents are required to be produced by Gibraltar anglers who want to fish from the North Mole?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The documents required to be produced by both Gibraltar and non-resident anglers who want to fish from the North Mole are Passport, Identity Card or Driving Licence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 299 AND 300 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government satisfied as to the security of the present arrangements?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes they are satisfied and complies with ISPS requirements.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government confirm whether this is the position, if somebody wants access to the North Mole and they produce an ID card they will be let through on the basis that they are an angler and presumably they have angling equipment with them or a fishing rod or whatever, whereas if one does not have the fishing rod then one cannot have access to the North Mole, is that the position?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

At what point does somebody check whether the person who has gone into North Mole with a fishing rod is actually fishing or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, there is a serious issue here and that is that the present system works well to a point in the sense that we could have a system of licensing, and indeed there are those in Government who would prefer a system of licensing as one would require in other countries. Spain, for example, requires to have a licence, they are quite easy to get one buys these fishing licences I think in banks and post offices and all sorts of places but one still needs a licence to go and we, it is just not in our culture. Can the hon Member just imagine when his child has grown up that he suddenly decides that 'daddy can you take me fishing this sunny Saturday afternoon?', can he just imagine saying to him 'I am sorry Johnny I cannot because I have not got a licence', it is just not in our culture to require people to have to get a licence to go and throw a line off the edge of the North Mole to sort of fish. If we go down the licensing route, which there are organisations in Gibraltar urging us to do that, it is actually quite curtailing of the spontaneous leisure activity that parents may want to do with their children, not having a licence and all of a sudden finding that one cannot just decide on the spur of the moment to go and take ones children or grandchildren fishing because one needs a licence. Those were the reasons why we have so far not decided to go to a licensing system but the situation is constantly under review and it may be that at some stage a licensing system may be the option that is pursued.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government aware that the curtailment which the Chief Minister describes is actually happening already and it is surprising or fitting that he describes the father and son wanting to go out to fish because those are some of the people that the Opposition have had coming with complaints? This is the second issue that arises from here. The complaint is this, that what is happening in different places of Gibraltar including the North Mole is that Spanish anglers are coming through with 20 fishing rods, placing them across the shoreline, this was until two weeks ago when I got complaints, Easter, in the North Mole and in other areas.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Two rods maximum.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly it is happening in other areas then, where they are coming through with 10 fishing rods, 20 fishing rods planting them all across the seafront and then depriving local anglers of the room in which to fish. Actually it is interesting that the Minister mentioned the father and son wanting to go and fish and being unable to because that is precisely what has already been happening and already complaints which have been made to the Opposition have been made, not exclusively, but certainly there were a few cases of people coming and saying 'well look this statement that you issued is actually true, this weekend my son wanted to go fishing, we decided to

go to the reclaimed area where the East Side development is earmarked for and there was a Spaniard there with 28 fishing rods right across the whole of the seafront and we had to go home'. The other point which is made and is similar to the diving point when we discussed the issue in Question No. 10 this morning, is that what non-resident anglers are doing here is what Gibraltar anglers cannot do in Spain. That is to say, one cannot go to Spain stand on a beach or a reclaimed area or whatever and start fishing just like that, one does need permits or licences. So in order to phrase all this as a question, can I ask the Minister whether they are satisfied with the present arrangements, both in terms of the North Mole and elsewhere, and whether Government will look at this matter and see whether any improvements can be made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am really not prepared to have the same debate as I had with him this morning in relation to diving in relation to fishing, so if he can sort of remember what I said to him this morning and carry it forward. At the end of the day we have a different culture, the Spanish practice and therefore culture is that one needs a licence to do a whole lot of things that one does not need a licence for here. I suppose we could replicate that culture but they are used to needing a licence and permission from the State to go and throw a fishing rod and we are not, and does one really want to tie up all our leisure activities and all our citizens freedoms to go about, does one really want to link it to the State so that one needs a piece of paper from Uncle Sam for every little thing that one wants to do. It is a way forward, I am not saying, of course it is possible to do that, it is possible to replicate the Spanish system. The question, and it is not a rhetorical question, there is an issue for debate, whether we want to in Gibraltar go down that road or whether we want to try and find some other way to address unfair situations. So for example, for ones 28 fishing rods along the East Side reclamation we may not need a system of licensing it may be possible to do it by legislation or by some regulation which limits fishing rods to two. In other words, extend to the whole of Gibraltar by some law what we have done in the Port through the enforcement of Port Regulations. That might be a possibility. I think, having the State regulate and licence individual people's activities, particularly leisure activities, should be a last resort, not a first resort because one could very quickly find oneself where one needs the Government's permission to do anything and everything. My personal philosophical instinct is to avoid that unless there is a very good reason that renders it unavoidable and inevitable. We can debate this and if we collectively come to the conclusion that we want to go down this sort of licence everything that moves route, we can do.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

If I could just not deviate entirely from the question but maybe broaden the debate. What has happened? I get elderly people coming to me and saying to me 'from time immemorial we have gone and walked to the North Mole, why should we have a fishing rod to be able to go for a walk to North Mole?' Are there serious security implications?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

With the greatest of respect to the hon Member, it is a little bit of an irresponsible piece of oratory because he well knows that it is not the Government that are

unilaterally and domestically decided to consider every Gibraltarian who does not have a fishing rod a security threat. He knows very well, because it has been explained to him in this House on several occasions, that this is an international code which some of our main cruising clients are making compulsory. In other words, if we do not comply with this code they will not allow ships that have visited the Port to visit our Port and they will not allow their cruise ships to call into our Port at all. Now, we can decide to suffer all those consequences and uniquely in the whole world, regard a commercial Port as a sort of social promenade. This community can make that choice if it wants to, it comes with a huge economic price tag. The hon Member has got to understand that this is not the Gibraltar Government deciding that for security reasons people should not be allowed in, it is the Gibraltar Government complying in the way that gives it most freedom to allow the historical event, which is fishing, to take place. There are those who argue that even the fishing facilities that are being allowed is stretching it. We think we have persuaded those who have to make the judgements internationally to accept the fishing thing, that is the context. He should regard the fishing regime, as it is at the moment, as something that we have salvaged from the implementation. He ought to consider, any other commercial port, does he know of any other commercial port in the world where people can just go in and out for leisure, it is very unusual nowadays.

Now we have had that historical culture, so his rhetorical oratory has to be considered in the context of external compulsion, that this is not something that we have chosen to do although frankly the idea of having youth driving around the Port at 3 o'clock in the morning after a long, wet night out in a discotheque frankly has always been an accident waiting to happen, as indeed it did. The inside of a Port is a dangerous place, there are trailers, there was an incident some years ago where a car full of kids crashed into a trailer and the corner of the trailer went in. Ports are not safe places, it is a sea wall with a precipice straight into the sea. So I think it is enough that we have salvaged the fishing. Only the other day I was walking down the street and somebody stopped the car and said to me if we could not do something at least about lifting, in fact I have been meaning to speak to my Colleague about it and have not yet had the opportunity, whether apparently after the ship goes it takes longer than this chap thought was necessary to lift the restrictions and let the fishermen in. I am sure there is some explanation because I am assured by the Port that the regime is the minimum that it has to be. So I would urge the hon Member not to say things that give the impression that there are things that the Government could easily do which they are not doing and the effect of that is some unnecessary curtailment of our leisure enjoyment here in Gibraltar. That is not the case.



ORAL

**NO. 301 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY**

Can Government list the areas of co-operation between the Gibraltar and Algeciras Port authorities that are planned for the meeting in Algeciras next month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The meeting to be held with the Algeciras Port Authority in late May 2005 is intended to be the commencement of discussions with a view of identifying areas of co-operation between both ports. The answer to the question will be forthcoming after the initial meeting has been held.

**NO. 302 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

Have any new applications for a bunkering licence been made since December 2004 and have any new licences been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

One application has been received which has resulted in the issue of a licence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 302 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say who the licence was issued to?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the name of the company is Bunkers (Gibraltar) Limited.

ORAL

**NO. 303 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

How many bunkering licences were there in place as at 31 March 2005, showing the name of the operator and the date when first issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 304 of 2005.

**NO. 304 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

How many bunkering licences were there in place as at 31 March 2005, showing the name of the operator and the date when first issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Licensing regime came into effect on 22 May 2002. The following entities were issued with licences at the time:-

Vemaoil Ltd  
Aegean  
CEPSA  
FAMM  
Shell

A further licence was issued to Bunkers (Gibraltar) Limited in March 2005. Prior to 22 May 2002, there was a sort of licence in place but not under the current system where there are certain specifications attached to the licence which all bunkering operators must adhere to.

**ORAL**

**NO. 305 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SHIPS VISITS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar since December 2004 inclusive for:

- a) bunkering;
- b) cargo;
- c) repairs;

on a monthly basis and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 305**

Ships calling at Gibraltar from December 2004 to March 2005:

<b>Month</b>	<b>Bunkering</b>	<b>Cargo</b>	<b>Repairs</b>
December 2004	458	11	9
January 2005	428	2	11
February 2005	439	2	6
March 2005	446	2	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1771</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>31</b>

Tonnes of bunker fuel sold at Gibraltar from December 2004 to March 2005

<b>Month</b>	<b>Tonnes</b>
December 2004	342,706
January 2005	323,251
February 2005	304,134
March 2005	312,064
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,282,155</b>

ORAL

**NO. 306 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Port Advisory Council met since 17 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Since 17 December 2004 the Port Advisory Council has met once, on 10 February 2005.

**NO. 307 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY**

Have Government been consulted by the UK on the European Commissions proposed directive on market access to port services and what is the view of the Government on what is being proposed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government have not been consulted by the UK in this matter.

The Government have not yet formulated a view on the proposed directive.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 307 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say, during the last House we discussed the role of Gibraltar in AMRIE and APRIE that were shipping organisations in the EU, whether any information has been made available to the Government through those organisations?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that the issue has been raised but only in the form of the fact that the whole of the EU members are totally in different views as to this directive. There is no consensus on the way forward and it is unlikely that there will be any major developments in the foreseeable future because of the disparity that there are different views on the directive.



**NO. 308 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SEA TRADE CONVENTION**

Can Government say why the Port of Gibraltar did not have its own stand at the Sea Trade Cruise Shipping Convention in Miami this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Gibraltar Port Authority and the Gibraltar Tourist Board always consider the marketing strategy for the concise business on the basis of effectiveness, value for money, the ability to access the desired target market and so on. The fact that Gibraltar attends a particular trade fair or event one year does not necessarily mean that it will attend the subsequent year's event in the same way, or at all.

In the case of Sea Trade Miami, the decision that was taken was to have a Gibraltar presence in two ways: through having a speaker and a delegate at the conference, and by having a presence in the Medcruise stand, from which to promote Gibraltar's cruise industry.

ORAL

**NO. 309 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SEA TRADE CONVENTION**

What was the cost with a breakdown of Gibraltar's attendance at the Sea Trade Cruise Shipping Convention in Miami in March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Schedule to Answer 309**

A Davis:

(a)	Air – Gibraltar/London/Miami/London/Gibraltar	£2,032.20
(b)	Hotel – 1 night London	£140.00
	4 nights Miami	£785.00
(c)	Half Subsistence	£328.82
(d)	Conference Pass	£673.48
	TOTAL:	£3,959.95

A Poggio:

(a)	Air – London/Miami/London	£1,975.00
(b)	Hotel Miami	£723.08
(c)	Conference Pass	£490.14(reduced Medcruise BoD Rate)
	TOTAL:	£3,188.22
	GRAND TOTAL:	£7,148.17

**NO. 310 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PORT – SECURITY**

What were the unforeseen Port security arrangements for the Port that have required additional funds of £75,000 beyond the £30,000 approved by the House in the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The international implementation on 1 July 2004 of the International Ship and Port Security Code, known as the ISPS Code, required the introduction of Port security, which cost £105,000 for the financial year. When the Estimates for 2004/2005 were prepared, the cost of providing security was not fully taken into account.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 310 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it was known that this would have to be done, that is the requirement was known at the beginning of the financial year, was it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the requirement was not known. We had put in an outline plan which was subject to audit. When the international auditors came to have a look at the security system they insisted on certain alterations and these alterations required additional expenditure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Given that the additional cost is more than twice the original budget, can the Minister say what were the nature of these alterations that cost three times as much as expected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, one was the inclusion of the ferry terminal area as part of the security area, and for there to avoid having to put security guards there on a 24 hour basis, we had to instal CCTV cameras in order for it to be controlled from the one post, in order to reduce costs on security guards. In other words, what we have done is invested more in capital and reduced on on-going expenditure in terms of man hours that would have been needed to be able to cater and oversee the whole system.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact then, is some of this additional £75,000 then money that has been spent on equipment?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, its totality has been spent on buying equipment.

ORAL

**NO. 311 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – COMPUTERS IMPORTED**

What was the value and number of computer items imported into Gibraltar since December 2004 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 312 and 313 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 312 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of goods vehicles imported by:

- a) individuals;
- b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 311 and 313 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 313 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of private motor vehicles imported by:

- a) individuals;
- b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.



**Schedule to Question 313****Answer to Question 311**

The value of computer hardware imported into Gibraltar on a monthly basis since December 2004 is as follows:

	Value of Computers (£)
Dec 04	374,697
Jan 05	528,146
Feb 05	417,005

We are unable to provide a figure for the number of computers imported into Gibraltar, as it is the individual components that are being imported and not fully assembled computers.

**Answer to Question 312**

The number and value of goods vehicles imported by individuals and licensed dealers on a monthly basis since December 2004 is as follows:

	Goods vehicles imported by individuals		Goods vehicles imported by licensed dealers	
	Number	Value (£ thousands)	Number	Value (£ thousands)
Dec 04	2	4	1	2
Jan 05	-	-	2	24
Feb 05	4	5	6	24

**Answer to Question 313**

The number and value of private motor vehicles imported by individuals and licensed dealers on a monthly basis since December 2004 is as follows:

	Private motor vehicles imported by individuals		Private motor vehicles imported by licensed dealers	
	Number	Value (£ thousands)	Number	Value (£ millions)
Dec 04	14	52.8	506	6.0
Jan 05	8	30.7	443	5.4
Feb 05	18	65.1	494	6.1

ORAL

**NO. 314 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TRADE – IMPORTS**

Can Government provide the total value of imports, excluding petroleum products, and the breakdown by country of origin for the year 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The total value of imports for 2004, excluding petroleum products, stood at £292 million. The breakdown by country will be published in the usual manner as part of the Abstract of Statistics 2004 later on this year.

ORAL

**NO. 315 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.2 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 1 (Lighting) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 316 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 316 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 1 (Lighting) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 and 317 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 317 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.5 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 2 (Power) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315, 316 and 318 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 318 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.3 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 3 (Domestic) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 317 and 319 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 319 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 3 (Domestic) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 318 and 320 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 320 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge for the Flexible Cost Adjustment Formula and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 319 and 321 to 333 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 321 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing 11.7 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 4 (Commercial) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 320 and 322 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 322 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 4 (Commercial) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 321 and 323 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 323 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the Primary Charge for Tariff 5 (Industrial Maximum Demand) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 322 and 324 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 324 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 5 (Industrial Maximum Demand) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 323 and 325 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 325 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12 per cent the Secondary Charge per unit consumed for Tariff 5 (Industrial Maximum Demand) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 324 and 326 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 326 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.5 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 6A and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 325 and 327 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 327 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 6A and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 326 and 328 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 328 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 11.1 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 6B and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 327 and 329 to 333 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 329 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 6B and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 328 and 330 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 330 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the Electricity Supply Connection charge and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 329 and 331 to 33 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 331 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 500 per cent the Discontinuation of Electricity Supply Charge and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 330, 332 and 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 332 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 11.1 per cent the rate per unit charged for Summer Air-Conditioning Tariff and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 331 and 333 of 2005.

**NO. 333 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Summer Air-Conditioning Tariff and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Question Nos. 332 and 333 refer to “summer air-conditioning tariff”. There is no such named tariff and consumers who might have separate installations for air-conditioning (or heating) are supplied under the Off-peak Tariff 6B.

In relation to Question No. 331 of 2005, the information requested cannot be provided for 2004/2005 since there have been no disconnections for non-payments for a number of years. The number of consumers that may be disconnected in the future would be dependent on the arrears situation and it is not possible to give any reliable figures at this stage. With those caveats, I now hand the hon Member a Table which gives him all the information that he has requested.

Answer to Question 333 of 2005

Increased Electricity Tariff - Billing

Tariff	Previously			Increased Tariff wef 1.4.05 = 4/05 bill		
	Unit Cost	FCA	Standing Charge	Unit Cost	FCA	Standing Charge
Lighting	£0.090	£0.0281	£2	£0.101	£0.0326	£4
Power	£0.080	£0.0281	£4	£0.090	£0.0326	£8
Domestic	£0.065	£0.0281	£2	£0.073	£0.0326	£4
Commercial	£0.060	£0.0281	£3	£0.067	£0.0326	£6
Industrial (KVAs)	£0.050	£0.0281	£4	£0.056	£0.0326	£8
Off Peak	£0.040	£0.0281	£3	£0.045	£0.0326	£8
Off Peak	£0.045	£0.0281	£3	£0.050	£0.0326	£6

Connection Charge	Previously	£5.00	W.e.f 1/4/05	£30.00
-------------------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

Tariff	Net Increase			Units Billed FY 04/05	Number of Consumers (as at 31.3.05)	Total		
	Unit Cost	FCA	Standing Charge			Unit Cost Increase	FCA Increase	Standing Charge
Lighting	£0.011	£0.0045	£2	300	498,022	£5,478	£2,241.10	£7,200
Power	£0.010	£0.0045	£4	62	329,996	£3,300	£1,484.98	£2,976
Domestic	£0.008	£0.0045	£2	12,616	51,300,308	£410,402	£230,851.39	£302,784
Commercial	£0.007	£0.0045	£3	2,782	66,206,735	£463,447	£297,930.31	£100,152
Industrial (KVAs)	£0.006	£0.0045	£4	34	14,073,966	£84,444	£63,332.85	£1,632
Off Peak	£0.005	£0.0045	£3	18	207,090	£1,035	£931.90	£648
Off Peak	£0.005	£0.0045	£3	17	823,208	£4,116	£3,704.44	£612
				15,829	133,439,325	£972,223	£600,476.96	£416,004
								£1,988,704.06

Connection Charge	net increase	£25.00	New connections during 04/05	1,394	Total increase	£34,850.00
-------------------	--------------	--------	------------------------------	-------	----------------	------------

Grand Total £2,023,554.06

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 315 TO 333 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I apologise if I have misled the House in respect of summer air-conditioning tariff but when I looked at Gazette 3461 of the 17<sup>th</sup> March, on page 123, there is a reference to summer air-conditioning tariff.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Apparently it is not in use any more then.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government confirm that in the Estimates that have been Tabled, the expected yield is included or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes, but when considering the implications of the answer I would ask him to bear in mind that, I do not want to refer to the Estimates but obliquely that Gibraltar Electricity Authority is now catered for elsewhere. So in terms of the Government's Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure the implication of it being included or not included, and I have told him that it is, is that it would alter the amount of subsidy, subvention that the Consolidated Fund would otherwise have to vote across.

ORAL

**NO. 334 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to receive in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 65.7 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Shipping from Waterport Wharf and North Mole and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 335 to 350 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 335 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 65.7 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Hotels and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 and 336 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 336 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Hotels and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334, 335 and 337 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 337 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Hospitals and Schools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 336 and 338 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 338 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to pay in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Hospitals and Schools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 337 and 339 to 350 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 339 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to pay in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16.7 per cent the charge per 100 litres for the first 4,500 litres of potable water supplied to domestic consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 338 and 340 to 350 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 340 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15.6 per cent the charge per 100 litres consumed in excess of 4,500 litres of potable water supplied to domestic consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 339 and 341 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 341 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Domestic Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 340 and 342 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 342 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water undelivered supplies from public fountain by small barrels, buckets or similar small containers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 341 and 343 to 350 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 343 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Swimming Pools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 342 and 344 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 344 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Swimming Pools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 343 and 345 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 345 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 344 and 346 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 346 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 345 and 347 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 347 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 346 and 348 to 350 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 348 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 347, 349 and 350 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 349 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Government Departments and the Ministry of Defence and Other Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 348 and 350 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 350 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Government Departments and the Ministry of Defence and Other Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule setting out all the information that he has requested.



Answer to Question 350 of 2005

Answer to Questions 334 to 350

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS WATER BY TYPE	NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS BY TARIFFS											
	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05
SHIPPING	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	22	22
HOSPITALS AND SCHOOLS	22	22	22	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
HOTELS	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11
DOMESTIC (Primary)	11706	11705	11691	11716	11718	11716	11706	11706	11720	11694	11681	11694
SWIMMING POOLS	15	15	15	15	15	16	16	18	18	19	18	18
INDUSTRIAL	40	39	38	39	37	38	41	40	42	40	41	40
GOVT. DEPTS. (IncMOD)	156	163	172	171	174	174	175	177	173	170	173	172
COMMERCIAL	1232	1232	1299	1308	1308	1311	1319	1320	1330	1313	1314	1316
FOUNTAINS	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
UPPER ROCK	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
INACTIVES	577	578	584	580	600	608	625	621	620	627	638	630
TOTAL NO. OF CUSTOMERS	13796	13802	13869	13900	13923	13934	13953	13953	13973	13933	13936	13940

Please note that Customer Number in respect of shipping includes accounts of shipping agents who will be billed for a number of vessels  
There were 504 sales vouchers to shipping in 2004-2005 However a number of these were for the supply of water to barges that subsequently may supply more than one vessel.

Table 1 to Question 350

Number of Customers by Type

Cont....

Cont'd Answer to Question 350 of 2005.

Cont'd Answer to Questions 344 to 350.

**POTABLE WATER TARIFF REVIEW**

Estimated additional revenues from Tariff increases of 1/4/05

Tariff	Category	Additional Revenue Estimated to be raised on projected quantity of water to be sold	Additional Revenue From Standing Chgs	TOTAL expected Additional Revenue 2005/2006
A	Shipping	£ 41,125	£ -	£ 41,125
B	Hospital/Schools	£ 12,735	£ 264	£ 12,999
C	Hotels	£ 23,571	£ 144	£ 23,715
D	Domestic (Primary)	£ 131,970	£ 210,744	£ 342,714
D	Domestic (Secondary)	£ 189,023	£ -	£ 189,023
E	Pools	£ 4,011	£ 180	£ 4,191
F	Industrial	£ 26,266	£ 492	£ 26,758
G	GOG/MOD	£ 43,767	£ 1,896	£ 45,663
H	Commercial	£ 97,078	£ 14,736	£ 111,814
I	Fountain	£ 48	£ 36	£ 84
J	Upper Rock	£ 909	£ 234	£ 1,143
		<b>£ 570,503</b>	<b>£ 228,726</b>	<b>£ 799,229</b>

Note the above is an estimate based on current product mix and anticipated sales

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 334 TO 350 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In relation to the yield of these changes which affect the water company, are they all reflected in a reduction in the Government's subvention or is some of this revenue sort of going to the company instead of going to the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the answer to the hon Member's question is yes but there are timing issues because the contribution in lieu of tariff increases is paid in arrears, so in the first place this subvention is for the benefit of the company but of course it will reduce next year's payment or contribution in lieu of rate increase by the Government. So it will have no effect when he looks at the budget, he will see from the Estimates book that it actually goes up this year but that is explained because it is in arrears. That payment by the Government is in arrears where this is current. So these revenue raising measures on water tariffs reduce the Government's subvention contribution in lieu of allowing them to raise tariffs to the company as of next year, financial year that is.

ORAL

**NO. 351 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £250 for a Self-Drive Operators Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 352 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 352 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £250 for a Road Haulage Operators Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 and 353 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 353 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 1,100 per cent the annual licence fee for a self-drive car and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351, 352 and 354 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 354 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the monthly licence fee for a self-drive car and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 353 and 355 to 481 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 355 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of amending the criteria and increasing the licence fees charged annually in respect of motorcycles and how many fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005 in respect of motorcycles that did not exceed 50cc, exceeded 50cc but did not exceed 150cc and that exceeded 250cc?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 354 and 356 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 356 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 22.2 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle not exceeding 507kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 355 and 357 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 357 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 20 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 507kgs but not exceeding 762kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 356 and 358 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 358 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 18.2 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 762kgs but not exceeding 1,016kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 357 and 359 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 359 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15.4 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,016kgs but not exceeding 1,270kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 358 and 360 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 360 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 14.3 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,270kgs but not exceeding 1,524kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 359, and 361 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 361 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.5 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,524kgs but not exceeding 1,778kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 360 and 362 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 362 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 14.6 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,778kgs but not exceeding 2,032kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 361 and 363 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 363 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16.1 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 2,032kgs but not exceeding 2,286kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 362 and 364 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 364 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 17.2 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 2,286kgs but not exceeding 2,540kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 363 and 365 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 365 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the annual licence fee charged for each additional 254kgs or part thereof in excess of 2,540kgs for a Private Motor vehicle and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 364 and 366 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 366 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee charged for registering a motorcycle with an engine capacity up to 50cc and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 365 and 367 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 367 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 20 per cent the fee charged for registering a vehicle other than a motorcycle with an engine capacity up to 50cc and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 366 and 368 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 368 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for a certificate of registration of a vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 367 and 369 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 369 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for a transfer of ownership of a vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 368 and 370 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 370 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for a Duplicate Certificate of Registration of a vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 369 and 371 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 371 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for an application for a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 370 and 372 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 372 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for every Road Service licence (per vehicle) and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 371 and 373 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 373 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for every transfer of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 372 and 374 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 374 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for every Road Service licence (per vehicle) and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 373 and 375 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 375 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 400 per cent the fee charged for every duplicate of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 374 and 376 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 376 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for every application for the amendment of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 375 and 377 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 377 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for every renewal of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 376 and 378 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 378 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 377 and 379 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 379 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 378 and 380 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 380 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for each additional Dealers licence issued to the same motor trader during the currency of the licence to use one vehicle at any one time and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 379 and 381 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 381 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the fee charged for the issue or renewal of a Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 380 and 382 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 382 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the fee charged for the issue of a duplicate Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 381 and 383 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 383 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for the issue of a duplicate of an Advanced Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 382 and 384 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 384 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the fee charged for the issue of a duplicate Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 383 and 385 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 385 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for inspecting the register, for each hour or part thereof, and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 384 and 386 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 386 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for providing a copy or extract from the registrar, for each folio of 72 words or part thereof, and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 385 and 387 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 387 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £25 for the addition of a further category to a Driving Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 386 and 388 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 388 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £25 for a change of particulars to a Driving Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 387 and 389 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 389 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £25 for the exchange of an EEA Driving Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 388 and 390 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 390 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 300 per cent the fee for a licence to drive a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 389 and 391 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 391 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 300 per cent the fee for a licence to act as conductor of a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 390 and 392 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 392 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 300 per cent the fee for a duplicate of any licence related to a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 391 and 393 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 393 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by charging £20 for the renewal of a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 392 and 394 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 394 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "A" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 393 and 395 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 395 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "B" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 394 and 396 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 396 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "C" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 395 and 397 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 397 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "C1" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 396 and 398 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 398 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "D" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 397 and 399 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 399 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "D1" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 398 and 400 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 400 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £50 for a category “B+E” driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 399 and 401 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 401 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "C+E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 400 and 402 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 402 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "C1+E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 401 and 403 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 403 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "D+E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 402 and 404 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 404 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "D1+E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 403 and 405 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 405 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of revenue raised in the financial year 2004/2005 by virtue of charging a fee of £40 for a category "E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 404 and 406 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 406 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 150 per cent the fee for a category "F to J" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 405 and 407 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 407 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "K" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 406 and 408 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 408 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 25 per cent the fee for an advanced driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 407 and 409 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 409 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 100 per cent the fee for a driving test for a Public Service Vehicle up to 8 seats in addition to the driver's seat and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 408 and 410 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 410 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing the annual licence fee by 24.4 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 2,032kgs but not exceeding 2,286kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 409 and 411 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 411 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £10 for a Theory "A" Category driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 410 and 412 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 412 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £10 for a Theory "B" Category driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 411 and 413 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 413 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £15 for a Theory “C” Category driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 412 and 414 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 414 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £10 for a Theory "D" Category driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 413 and 415 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 415 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Private Car and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 414 and 416 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 416 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Motorcycle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 415 and 417 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 417 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Public Service Vehicle with over 8 seats and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 416 and 418 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 418 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Public Service Vehicle with no more than 8 seats and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 417 and 419 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 419 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Goods Vehicle with an unladen weight of over 1,525kgs and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 418 and 420 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 420 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Goods Vehicle with an unladen weight of no more than 1,525kgs and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 419 and 421 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 421 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 66.7 per cent the fee for the application for examination of a Trailer and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 420 and 422 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 422 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 92.3 per cent the fee for the re-examination of a vehicle under regulation 23 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 421 and 423 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 423 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee for the issue of a duplicate roadworthiness certificate and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 422 and 424 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 424 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee for the purchase of a Personalised Number and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 423 and 425 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 425 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee for the transfer of ownership of a Personalised Number and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 424 and 426 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 426 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 43.5 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 508kgs but not exceeding 762kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 425 and 427 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 427 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 41.7 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 762kgs but not exceeding 1,270kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 426 and 428 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 428 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 35.7 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 1,270kgs but not exceeding 1,524kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 427 and 429 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 429 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 33.3 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 1,524kgs but not exceeding 1,778kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 428 and 430 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 430 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 28.6 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 1,778kgs but not exceeding 2,032kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 429 and 431 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 431 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the renewal of a Work Permit for Workers from Central and Eastern European Countries and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 430 and 432 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 432 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for an application for a Work Permit for Detached Workers and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 431 and 433 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 433 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for an application for a Work Permit for Workers from Central and Eastern European Countries and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 432 and 434 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 434 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the Annual Notification of a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 433 and 435 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 435 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Statement on Variations in the Particulars of a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 434 and 436 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 436 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state what additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increase from £7 to £10 per person on the departure tax on civil aircraft passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 435 and 437 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 437 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the application for a wholesale licence for single premises and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 436 and 438 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 438 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the annual renewal of a wholesale licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 437 and 439 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 439 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the application for a wholesale licence for single premises and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 438 and 440 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 440 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £500 per annum for the licence of operating a bonded store measuring 50sqm or less?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 439 and 441 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 441 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £1,000 per annum for the licence of operating a bonded store measuring more than 50sqm?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 440 and 442 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 442 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of adding a charge of 5 per cent on items 2203.00.03, 2204.10.01, 2204.10.02, 2204.10.03, 2204.21.01, 2204.21.02, 2205.10.00, 2203.00.01 and 2203.00.02 referred to in column 4 of the table in Chapter 22 of Schedule 2 of the Import Duty (Integrated Tariff) Regulations 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 441 and 443 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 443 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Street Traders of any goods excluding flowers and greenery to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 442 and 444 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 444 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Street Traders of flowers and greenery to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 443 and 445 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 445 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Pedlars of market produce to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 444 and 446 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 446 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Pedlars of articles of food or drink not being market produce to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 445 and 447 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 447 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Other Pedlars to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 446 and 448 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 448 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee when an empty coffin is delivered by hearse and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 447 and 449 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 449 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee when an empty coffin is not delivered by hearse and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 448 and 450 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 450 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the office fee (previously £10 now £15) referred to in schedule 2, paragraph 4 in relation to indent (b) of the Licensing (Fees) Rules 1991 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 449 and 451 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 451 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the office fee (previously £20 now £30) referred to in schedule 2, paragraph 4 in relation to indent (b) of the Licensing (Fees) Rules 1991 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 450 and 452 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 452 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 451 and 453 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 453 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 452 and 454 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 454 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 75 per cent the fee charged for each child aged 5 to 11 inclusive who pays £0.50 for entry as a walker and subsequently wishes to visit tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 453 and 455 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 455 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16.7 per cent the fee charged for each person aged 12 and over who pays £1.00 for entry to the 100 Ton Gun and subsequently wishes to visit tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 454 and 456 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 456 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee charged for each person aged 12 and over who pays £0.50 for entry as a walker and subsequently wishes to visit tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 455 and 457 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 457 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee charged for each person for entry at Jew's Gate as part of a tour group with a tour operator or in a taxi on an inclusive 'Rock Tour' and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 456 and 458 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 458 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee charged for each person for entry from the cable car middle or top stations for the purposes of visiting any tourist site if admission ticket is pre-purchased at the cable car bottom station and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 457 and 459 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 459 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 14.3 per cent the fee charged for each person aged 12 and over for entry at Jew's Gate and Willis's Road for persons visiting tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 458 and 460 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 460 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £100 annual registration fee as a Port operator?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 459 and 461 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 461 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £10,000 bunkering licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 460 and 462 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 462 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £3000 stevedoring licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 461 and 463 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 463 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 ship repairing licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 462 and 464 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 464 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 ship agency licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 463 and 465 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 465 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 ship chandlery licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 464 and 466 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 466 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £250 dolphin boat operator licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 465 and 467 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 467 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the “any other port operator licence”?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 466 and 468 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 468 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £2.00 annual fee for registration of a port worker?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 467 and 469 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 469 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the annual fee of £2.00 for re-registration of a port worker?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 468 and 470 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 470 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £5.00 fee for issue of a renewal certificate of registration as a port worker?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 469 and 471 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 471 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £5.00 fee for issue of a renewal of a certificate of registration as a port operator?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 470 and 472 to 481 of 2005.

**NO. 472 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the following under the Port Operations and Fees Regulation 2005:

- a) the £5.00 fee for issue of a duplicate certificate;
- b) the £5.00 fee for Endorsement certificate of registration;
- c) the £5.00 fee for an Amendment certificate of registration;
- d) the £10.00 fee for Inspection of a licence;
- e) the £5.00 fee for a Certified copy of a licence or certificate;
- f) the £5.00 fee for a Inspection of an application;
- g) the £5.00 fee for a Copy of an application?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 471 and 473 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 473 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the increase from £0.04 to £0.06 in the bunkering levy per ton?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 472 and 474 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 474 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £60.00 passenger certificate issued pursuant to rule 72 of the Port Rules?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 473 and 475 to 481 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 475 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the following charges under Paragraph 3 Schedule 4 of the Port Rules:

- a) the increase from £0.50 to £2.00 per tonnes deadweight for a lighter;
- b) the increase from £10.00 to £20.00 for a pleasure boat over 10ft in length;
- c) the increase from £0.10 to £0.50 for a carrier of petroleum, water or any other product?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 474 and 476 to 481 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 476 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £62.50 charge for a Suez Canal Certificate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 475 and 477 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 477 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £2.50 per square metre charge for a portacabin?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 476 and 478 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 478 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £2.50 per square metre charge for the storage of oil drums?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 477 and 479 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 479 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 charge for first registration as a Port Operator?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 478, 480 and 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 480 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £50.00 fee for each overland container being used, unstuffed at any unstuffing shed in the container berth?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 479 and 481 of 2005.

**NO. 481 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 1,438.5 per cent the fee charged for the annual licence for Premises or Ships and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member tables listing individually all the revenue-raising measures with full details of what the fees were before the increases and the level of the increases, the previous revenue and the projected additional revenue from the increases. Also details of when each of these fees were last increased and a cross-reference to each individual question to assist him in his analysis of the answer.

Answer to Question 481  
PORT

TABLE 1

ITEM	QUESTION NUMBER	CURRENT FEE	LAST INCREASE	PROPOSED FEE	CURRENT ESTIMATED YIELD P.A	ADDITIONAL ESTIMATED REVENUE YIELD P.A
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	460/2005	£100.00	INTRODUCED 3.5.01	£100.00	£4,200.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	461/2005	£10,000.00	"	£10,000.00	£60,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	462/2005	£3,000.00	"	£3,000.00	£3,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	463/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	464/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£15,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	465/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£6,000.00	Remains unchanged
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE	466/2005	£250.00	"	£250.00	£1,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	467/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£13,100.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	468/2005	NIL	NEW	£2.00 PER PERSON	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	469/2005	NIL	NEW	£2.00 PER PERSON	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	470/2005	NIL	NEW	£5.00 PER CERT.	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	471/2005	NIL	NEW	£5.00 PER OPS.	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	472/2005	NIL	NEW	£5.00/£10.00	NIL	Not commenced
BUNKERING CHARGES	473/2005	£0.04	INTRODUCED 2002	£0.06	£150,000.00	£75,000.00
PAX SHIP CERTIFICATES	474/2005	NIL	NEW	£60.00	NIL	£1,000.00
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE (1)	475/2005 (A)	£0.50	N/A	£0.50	N/A	N/A
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE (2)	(B)	£10.00	INTRODUCED 1993	£20.00	£6,000.00	£6,000.00
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE (3)	(C)	£0.50	N/A	£0.50	N/A	N/A
SUEZ CANAL CERTIFICATES	476/2005	£50.00	N/A	£62.50	NIL	£1,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS (3)	477/2005	£2.00 PER S.F.	1984	£2.40 PER S.F	£8,500.00	£1,700.00
MISCELLANEOUS (4)	478/2005	£2.00 PER S.F.	1984	£2.50 PER S. METRE	£3,010.00	£2,560.00
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	479/2005	£1,000.00	INTRODUCED 3.5.01	£1,000.00	£3,000.00	UNABLE TO ESTIMATE
CONTAINER UNSTUFFING	480/2005	NIL	N/A	£50.00	NIL	£72,000.00
LICENCE SHIP & PREMISES	481/2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIL	NO SUCH LICENCE KNOWN

(1) This fee was amended in March 2005, from £2 to 50p (due to misprint) hence no additional revenue yield.

(2) This fee was amended in March 2005, from 10p to 50p (due to misprint in Gazette) hence no additional revenue yield.

(3) The current increase made by the Port (Amendment) Rules 2005 (L.N. 59/2005 31 March 2005) raised the fee from £2.00 per square foot to £2.40 per square foot. However, the Port (Amendment) (No.2) Rules 2005 makes provision for the fee to be raised to £2.50 per sq. metre, but this legislation has not been commenced.

(4) The Port (Amendment) (No.2) Rules 2005 make provision for the fee to be raised to £2.50 per sq. metre, but this legislation has not been commenced.

Cont ...

**Contd Answer to Question 481****Table 2****Employment**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
Issue of work permit (400)	433/05	£10	Introduced 1994	£20 <sup>1</sup>	£4K	+ £4K
Renewal of work permit (1100)	431/05	£5	Introduced 1994	£10 <sup>1</sup>	£5K	+ £5K
Detached worker notification (700)	432/05	£20 p.a.	Introduced 1994	£50p.a.	£14K	+ £21K
Employer registration (300)	452/05 453/05	£25	Introduced 1991	£50	£8K	+ £8K
Annual notification/renewal (2800)	434/05	£10	Introduced 1991	£20	£28K	+ £28K
Variation notification (300)	435/05	£5	Introduced 1991	£10	£1K	+ £1K

( ) Figures in brackets show approx. annual number issued.

**Cont ...**



**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 3**

**Customs**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
Import duties						
- Wines	442/05	- containers <2 litres	1984	5% ad valorem	£186K	£ 95K
- Malt liquors	442/05	-bottles/cans 27p/litre - casks 14p/litre	1984	5% ad valorem	£438K	£174K
Tobacco licences						
- wholesale	437/05	£500	1997	£1000	'n'	-
- each add premises	439/05	£ 70	1997	£ 150	'n'	-
- renewal	438/05	£150	1997	£ 300	£3K	+ £3K
Bonded Stores (new) (64)	441/05 440/05	-	-	Large £1000 <sup>1</sup> Small £ 500 <sup>1</sup>	-	+£38K +£13K

( ) number issued.  
'n' less than £1K

**Cont ...**

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 4**

**Civil Status and Registration**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Revenue Yield p.a.
Apostille	450/05	£10	2000	£15	£132K	+ £66K
Emergency service	451/05	£20	2000	£30	£ 57K	+ £28K

**Cont ...**

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 4**

**Civil Status and Registration**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Revenue Yield p.a.
Apostille	450/05	£10	2000	£15	£132K	+ £66K
Emergency service	451/05	£20	2000	£30	£ 57K	+ £28K

**Cont ...**

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 5**

**Tourism**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
<u>Tourism</u>						
Upper Rock entry fee	454/05* to 459/05	Various	1998	Add. £1 per person	£2.17m	+ £ 550K
Airport Passenger tax	436/05	£7	2001	£ 10	£1.17m	+ £ 450K

\* Breakdown sought is not available.

**Cont ...**

TRANSPORT

Table 6

Contd Answer to Question 481							
Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
Self Drive operators licence	351/2005	New fees introduced	—	£250.00	*	*	*
Road Haulage Operators Licence	352/2005	New fees introduced	—	£250.00	*	*	*
Self Drive Cars	353/2005	£12.00	1-12-90	£24.00	£4,212.00	£4212.00	351
Monthly licence self drive car	354/2005	Does not exist					
Motor Vehicle Licence	355/2005	0 to 124cc	1-6-87	£15.00	£43,050.00	£21525.00	2152
Motorcycles		125 To 249cc		£35.00	£23,370.00	£3895.00	129
		£30		£45.00	£20,800.00	£2600.00	65
		250 and over					
Private Motor Vehicles (not exceeding 507 Kgs)	356/2005	£45.00	1-6-87	£55.00	£675.00	£150.00	15
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 507 Kgs not exceeding 762 Kgs)	357/2005	£50.00	1-6-87	£60.00	£32,250.00	£6450.00	645
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 762 Kgs not exceeding 1016 Kgs)	358/2005	£55.00	1-6-87	£65.00	£206,800.00	£37,600.00	3760
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1016 Kgs not exceeding 1270 Kgs)	359/2005	£65.00	1-6-87	£75.00	£221,000.00	£34,000.00	3400
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1270 Kgs not exceeding 1524 Kgs)	360/2005	£70.00	1-6-87	£80.00	£148,120.00	£21,160.00	2116
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1524 Kgs not exceeding 1778 Kgs)	361/2005	£80.00	1-6-87	£90.00	£64,320.00	£8,040.00	804
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1778 Kgs not exceeding 2032 Kgs)	362/2005	£100.00	1-6-87	£110.00	£62,900.00	£6,290.00	629
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 2032 Kgs not exceeding 2286 Kgs)	363/2005	£120.00	1-6-87	£130.00	£37,200.00	£3,100.00	310
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 2286 Kgs not exceeding 2540 Kgs)	364/2005	£140.00	1-6-87	£150.00	£3,920.00	£280.00	28
Private Motor Vehicles (each additional 254 Kgs in excess of 2540 Kgs)	365/2005	Sliding scale	1-6-87	Sliding scale	£8614.00	£500.00	50
Registration of Motorcycle up to 50 cc	366/2005	£10.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£3,630.00	£1,815.00	181
Registration of any other vehicle	367/2005	£25.00	01-12-90	£30.00	£66,125.00	£13,225.00	529
Certificate of Registration	368/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£16,260.00	£32,520.00	6504
Transfer of Ownership	369/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£16,590.00	£33,180.00	6636
Duplicate Certificate of Registration	370/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£4,970.00	£9,940.00	1988

\* not possible to determine the number of applicants who may apply.

Cont ...

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 6 (Cont'd)**

Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
Application for a Road Service Licence	371/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£50.00	Depends on the number of applications No new applications received	Nil	
For every road service licence (per vehicle)	372/2005	£100.00	01-12-90	£250.00	£12,200.00	£18,300.00	122
For every transfer of a road service licence	373/2005	£100.00	01-12-90	£250.00	Variable depends on no of transactions	Nil	
For every road service licence (per vehicle)	374/2005	THE SAME AS QUESTION 372/2005					
For every duplicate road service licence	375/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£25.00	Variable depends on no of transactions	Nil	
For every application for the amendment of a road service licence	376/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£50.00	Variable depends on no of transactions	Nil	
For every renewal of a road service licence	377/2005	£10.00	01-12-90	£100.00	£100.00	£22,200.00	10
For a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time	378/2005	£100.00	01-12-90	£200.00	£2,900.00	£2,900.00	29
For a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time	379/2005	THE SAME AS QUESTION 378/2005					
For each additional Dealers licence issued to the same motor trader during the currency of the licence	380/2005	£25.00	01-12-90	£50.00	£3,025.00	£3,025.00	121
For the issue or renewal of a driving licence	381/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	£17,312.00	£4,338.00	866
For the issue of a duplicate driving licence	382/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	£11,149.00	£2,776.00	557
Duplicate Advanced Driving Certificate	383/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£0.00	£0.00	
For the issue of a duplicate driving licence	384/2005	THE SAME AS QUESTION 382/2005					
For inspecting the register, for each hour or part thereof	385/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£1,150.00	£2,300.00	230
For a copy or extract from the register for each folio of 72 words or part thereof	386/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£0.00	£0.00	

Cont ...

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 6 (Cont'd)**

Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
For additional entitlement	387/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	This fee is included in issue of new licence		
For a change in particulars	388/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	This fee is included in issue of new licence		
Exchanging licences from other EEA States	389/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	£3,575.00	£875.00	178
For a licence to drive	390/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£3,985.00	£11,915.00	797
for a licence to act as a conductor	391/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£0.00	£0.00	
For a duplicate of any licence	392/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£15.00	£45.00	3
Renewal of licence to drive or conduct a Public Service Vehicle	393/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£625.00	£1875.00	125
A Category	394/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£30.00	£6,000.00	£3,000.00	300
B Category	395/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£30.00	£17,200.00	£8,600.00	860
C Category	396/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£1,000.00	£500.00	25
C1 Category	397/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£400.00	£200.00	10
D Category	398/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
D1 Category	399/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£800.00	£400.00	20
B+E Category	400/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£400.00	£100.00	10
C+E Category	401/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
C1+E Category	402/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£200.00	£100.00	5
D+E Category	403/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
D1+E Category	404/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
Amount raised in the Financial Year 2004/2005 for an "E" Category Driving test at a fee of £40.00	405/2005	E category not tested on its own. It is combined with other category					
F to J	406/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£400.00	£600.00	20
K - Moped	407/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£30.00	£2,800.00	£1,400.00	70
Advance Driving Test	408/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£80.00	£20.00	2
Public Service Vehicle up to 8 seats	409/2005	£25.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£375.00	£375.00	15
Annual licence fee Taxi exceeding 2032 Kgs but not exceeding 2286 Kgs	410/2005	£41.00	1-6-87	£51.00	£41.00	£10.00	1
Theory "A" Category	411/2005	£5.00	1999	£10.00	£3,280.00	£3,280.00	656
Theory "B" Category	412/2005	£5.00	1999	£10.00	£2,340.00	£2,340.00	468
Theory "C" Category	413/2005	£10.00	1999	£15.00	£350.00	£175.00	35
Theory "D" Category	414/2005	£10.00	1999	£15.00	£300.00	£150.00	30
Roadworthiness Testing Private Motor Vehicle	415/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£20.00	£105,000.00	£35,000.00	7000
Roadworthiness Testing Motor cycle	416/2005	£10.00	24-07-97	£15.00	£20,000.00	£10,000.00	2000

Cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

Table 6 (Cont'd)

Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
Roadworthiness Testing PSV with seating capacity for more than 8 passengers	417/2005	£30.00	24-07-97	£45.00	£3,000.00	£1,500.00	100
Roadworthiness Testing PSV with seating capacity not for more than 8 passengers	418/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£20.00	£1,800.00	£600.00	120
Roadworthiness Testing Goods vehicle the unladen weight over 1525 Kilograms	419/2005	£25.00	24-07-97	£40.00	£3,750.00	£2,250.00	3725
Roadworthiness Testing Goods vehicle the unladen weight under 1525 Kilograms	420/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£20.00	£12,750.00	£4,250.00	12735
Roadworthiness Testing Trailer	421/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£25.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
Re-exam under Reg 23	422/2005	£13.00	24-07-97	£25.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
For the issue of a duplicate roadworthiness certificate	423/2005	£5.00	24-07-97	£10.00	£500.00	£500.00	100
Personalised Number	424/2005	£100.00	1985	£200.00	£19,600.00	£19,600.00	196
Transfer of Personalised Number	425/2005	£20.00	1997	£50.00	£2,540.00	£4,460.00	127
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 508 Kgs but not exceeding 762 Kgs	426/2005	£23.00	1-6-87	£33.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 762 Kgs but not exceeding 1270 Kgs	427/2005	£24.00	1-6-87	£34.00	£144.00	£60.00	6
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 1270 Kgs but not exceeding 1524 Kgs	428/2005	£28.00	1-6-87	£38.00	£728.00	£260.00	26
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 1524 Kgs but not exceeding 1778 Kgs	429/2005	£30.00	1-6-87	£40.00	£1,530.00	£510.00	51
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 1778Kgs but not exceeding 2032 Kgs	430/2005	£35.00	1-6-87	£45.00	£700.00	£200.00	20



**Contd Answer to Question 481**

Table 7

Environment

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
<u>Environment</u>						
Street Traders & Pedlars fees (30)	443/05 to 447/05*	£6 (+£6 if use motor vehicle)	1980	£20	£3K	£4K
Provision of hearse	448/05 449/05	£15/£20	1995	£30/£40	£5K	£5K

\* Breakdown sought is not available.

**ORAL**

**NO. 482 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPETENT AUTHORITY**

Can the Attorney General confirm that the Chief Secretary will be legally empowered to discharge the functions of the Competent Authority of a Member State under the provisions of Article 3 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1763/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 483 of 2005.

**NO. 483 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPETENT AUTHORITY**

Can the Attorney General confirm that the Chief Secretary will be legally empowered to discharge the functions of the Competent Authority of a Member State under the provisions of Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 798/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, the Chief Secretary is legally empowered to discharge the functions of Competent Authority under the laws of Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 482 AND 483 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government appreciate that I am seeking a legal as opposed to a political view? I take it for granted that the political view is that that is the case otherwise we would not be having a motion before the House approving the thing, but having read the text we would like a legal view confirming this before we come to vote on it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not issue legal opinions in the House to the Opposition, but the hon Member is entitled to assume that if the Government bring legislation to this House, the Government which includes their law officers, are satisfied as to the legality of the Bill. If we were not satisfied as to the legality of the Bill then we would not bring it to the House. Therefore he can read the answer to his question, or rather he can read the answer to his request for a legal as opposed to a political assessment of the question by the fact that the Government have brought the legislation. The competence of authorities in Gibraltar is a matter for the laws of Gibraltar, that is the position and therefore the Chief Secretary is and will be competent under the Regulations that we are going to approve to do that. I have to say to the hon Member in partial contradiction of what I have just said, that there are political circumstances in which the Government might bring legislation to the House to make a political point, such as failure to accommodate Gibraltar properly in an EU measure, even if we thought that it was of dubious enforceability, not legality. To ask whether something is legal or not legal is to suggest that it is illegal to do it. It is a question of whether it is enforceable but of course in those circumstances we would

say so. We would make that point to the House, but when the Government bring legislation to this House without comment then the hon Members are entitled to assume that the Government are persuaded that it is fully enforceable and that this is not just a political point in the making, despite the Government's view on enforceability.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept entirely what the Chief Minister has said as regards our own law, that is to say the law that we pass here is the law that authorises the Chief Secretary or anybody else to do whatever the law says. What we are going to be asked to do is approve what has already been done by His Excellency the Governor, which can only come in if it is approved by a resolution of the House. So implicit in that is that all the people, including the Governor, believe that what they are doing is what the law provides, but I think if we are going to be voting a resolution in this House the responsible thing for us to do is to look at the text of the relevant Regulation to see whether in our judgement in fact we are permitted by the Regulation to do what we are doing, whether it is legal in that sense. Now, in fact having established that it is the established practice in the United Kingdom Parliament that the Attorney General is asked to give legal opinions on matters on which the House has to take decisions to the Parliament as well as to the Government, then that his role is to advise the Parliament as well as the Government, because the Chief Minister has sometimes said to me that he is not here to give me advice as a lawyer, and I accept that he is not, but I believe that the Attorney General is and that is why the thing is addressed to the Attorney General. I assume that the Government have taken note of the fact that the Regulation in question allows a provision which is in fact a derogation from the requirement of the Regulation. If the Attorney General were here then I would be able to ask him but certainly I hope the Attorney General is here when we come to vote on the motions because we are not happy that what we are doing is in fact explained simply by the answer that we have been given today and we would like to be sure that what we are doing is in fact not challengeable.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the hon Member's view that he is not willing to vote anything that may be challengeable is a very new one, and as I say, he is perfectly entitled to want to know whether something is a proper transposition of the Regulation before he votes on it and to ask that of the Government, and I am telling him that the Government do not do that by giving written legal opinions through the Attorney General or anybody else for that matter, I am saying to the hon Member that it is implicit in the fact that the Government are bringing the legislation that the Government consider that it is a proper way to do things. I would as an aside and without any degree of animosity, say to the hon Member that the proposal that he suggests that the Attorney General should somehow be required to certify the, I cannot remember if he used the word 'legality' or 'compliance' or 'appropriateness or suitability of the laws in this House', before this House were willing to pass them, would set a hugely dangerous precedent at least whilst we have the present constitutional model, so the idea that this House can only pass what the Attorney General is satisfied, is passable or should be passed, is not a view which I think any of us could live with. Of course the suggestion may be made in the context of an innocuous example but once the principle is yielded to, of course it would have much wider application and I am not sure that that is what we want. The Attorney General serves a variety of roles. He is

the Government's legal adviser, he is the Governor's legal adviser and he is the director of public prosecutions. Those are his three distinct constitutional roles.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and therefore he is not the legal adviser of the Parliament of Gibraltar, unlike his counterpart in the United Kingdom?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not think he is, I do not think that is the case.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the matter has in fact recently been debated and it is apparently established and accepted going back to Clement Atlee and 1946, so I suggest the matter is researched because it is not an innovation. I must say that in the past the Attorney General has in fact answered questions in this House when I was in Government and when I was in Opposition before. The question is addressed to him and can I just say that when the Chief Minister talks about domestic legislation, this is not domestic legislation. The Regulations are already the laws of Gibraltar. Yes, because directives are what we transpose into our laws but regulations are primary laws of the European Community, and therefore if we have got these two regulations, what we have to do is to put in Gibraltar the machinery to give effect. That machinery is being done by the Governor, not by the Chief Minister or the Attorney General, and the House is being asked to approve what the Governor has already done and published in the Gazette. Now, what the Governor has published in the Gazette permits the competent authority in Gibraltar to do what the regulations permit the competent authority of a Member State to do, except that in the regulation it says the competent authorities are able to do x, y and z and the competent authorities are listed. Now, the point that I would wish Her Majesty's Attorney General to address is, if the competent authority that this House is happy to have, we are not opposed to our competent authority being the Chief Secretary but if the regulations give the power to entities listed in the EU Regulation to depart from the requirements, can we depart from those requirements without being listed? That is the point we would want and we will raise it certainly when we come to having to vote on this, and I hope that we are able to get a clear answer on that point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that the hon Member will get a clearer answer. There is only one Government, everybody sitting on this side of the House is part of that Government, I do not share the hon Member's constitutional making on the hoof that the Attorney General is the legal adviser of this House, I have told him whose legal adviser the Attorney General is, I do not believe that the Attorney General is the legal adviser of Parliament. If the Attorney General in the United Kingdom were the legal adviser of the House of Commons, then his opinion about the legality of the United Kingdom's involvement in the war against Iraq, would not have been given to the Prime Minister it would have been given to the Parliament who also had to vote on going to war or not going to war, without the benefit of knowing the Attorney General's legal opinion on the matter. So I do not accept the premise of the Leader of the Opposition's

question or on his attempt to carve out that new constitutional role for the Attorney General. The hon Member also, when he speaks about this being the act of the Governor, well of course it is the hand of the Governor but the hon Member also knows, because I inherited and then further developed his own policy on the matter when I came into office in 1996, is that there are certain issues on which the Governor means Government and the Governor signs and does, I suppose he would refuse to sign things that he thought were improper or illegal, but so long as it is not in an issue which is of his constitutional prerogative, for example internal security and things of that nature, then the Governor intervenes in the signing of these regulations qua Government, and the idea that this regulation is the act of the Governor in the sense that he has instructed it to be drafted, that he has made the various decisions and exercised the various choices and options that it contains, to his knowledge, is not how these things work. He knows that this is the Government, that the Government do the drafting, that the Government make the choices to the extent that there are choices or options in these matters, and then passes the matter up to His Excellency for his signature, because of course the European Communities Ordinance vests the power to actually sign these things in His Excellency. That is the way it happens.

The Government are entirely satisfied that the Chief Secretary has complete competence to exercise these functions in Gibraltar and the European Union regulation does not specify a different competent authority for Gibraltar. It specifies the competent authority for the United Kingdom but Gibraltar is not the United Kingdom, and therefore there is no incompatibility. He may want to argue that the regulation's list of competent authorities is deficient because it is short because there is one item missing in it, and this is a discussion that we have had on a number of occasions, but he cannot argue that it is in contradiction with our regulation. Treasury is listed, in fact it is listed in our own regulation, the Treasury is listed as the competent authority for the United Kingdom. That is what the regulation says, for the United Kingdom the competent authority shall be the Treasury. Question, who is the competent authority for Gibraltar? The regulation does not say, the European Regulation does not say and therefore we are advised that Gibraltar is free to designate its own, which we have done, and the European Community is free to decide whether it wishes to correct the obvious error, at least he will agree that it is a deficiency in the regulation as with so many other cases where we have come across, periodically, where they do not make provision for our competent authority. We do not in those cases accept, and therefore, because they do not list our competent authority therefore the competent authority for Gibraltar must be whoever it lists for the United Kingdom. We do not take that view and neither is he to take that view, well historically Gibraltar has not taken that view and this that we are doing on this occasion, is just a continuation of the basis upon which we have dealt with these situations on all the occasions that they have risen. So the Government are confident and the hon Members can raise their points, whatever points they want including whatever view they might have about these questions, on the debate on the motion.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I have already indicated that we intend to do that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would urge the hon Member if he would just give way, to resist the temptation to make points which then can come back to haunt us all when it comes to other examples of this, and that this Parliament should not be expressing a view which facilitates decisions by others not to properly include us and not to properly accommodate Gibraltar's constitutional position in EU measures generally. Of course if this House sends the signal that in cases where the directive or the regulation does not specify Gibraltar, then a substantial part of the Parliament in Gibraltar thinks that in those circumstances the competent authority for Gibraltar has to be domestically, that has as he knows a very wide read-across.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think nothing that I have said has that wide read-across. I think the more the Chief Minister elaborates on possible interpretations of what I may have said, seems to me the more he is running the risk of what he wants to avoid. All I am saying, and the Chief Minister has chosen to answer the question which was specifically addressed to the Attorney General, presumably because the Government's view is that the Attorney General may not answer questions addressed to him, because I know he has acted as Attorney General on a number of occasions here when moving things which the Attorney General is required to move, but now I am assuming that he is not answering my question as acting Attorney General that is, and answering my question as Chief Minister and consequently that it is a political decision that the Attorney General should not answer it. Now, the point of course that we are raising and is being addressed is because on this occasion, this is in our judgement quite different from many other examples that we have come across where competent authorities are given the power to grant licences or do things, which they then do and if people argue that they are not a proper competent authority well then they can challenge the validity of the documents that are issued. But here we have got a situation where what the article in the regulation says, is that what is prohibited and therefore illegal, may by way of derogation be done by the authority listed in Annex 2. I am not a lawyer, Mr Speaker is and so is the Chief Minister, but to me as a citizen faced with reading a law, as a layman, it would seem to me that if the law says 'you are prohibited from doing (a) unless by way of derogation you happen to be one of the people listed in the Annex' and I am not one of those people, then whatever the law of Gibraltar may say this prohibits me from doing it. Now, it is a point on which I would welcome a technical reply from the technical person in the Government, that is the adviser of the Government and the Governor, and I had hoped will be the adviser of this House when there are matters like this to be done, and which certainly seems to be the view in the UK Parliament and it is an issue that came up specifically in relation to the Iraq war. So the matter which has been researched for me by my hon Colleague on my right, has come out in the UK press and Lord Goldsmith has accepted his duty to Parliament on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2003.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

His duty to Parliament to do what?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

To advise Parliament on the legal issues precisely and on the legal advice he gave the Government on the war, which is the example that he gave.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Assuming that the hon Member is correctly citing from a press article and therefore I am assuming that the press article is correct, neither of which I do by the way, then he must conclude that the Attorney General in the UK has singularly failed in his duty to Parliament, because he has singularly failed to advise Parliament of the legality of war. In fact Parliament has only discovered this after it had risen for the election because somebody leaked the opinion.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, that is actually entirely wrong. What the Attorney General did was recognise on 10<sup>th</sup> March his duty principally to advise Parliament on legalities, what has been called for repeatedly, and we should not fall into the trap of discussing the politics of another place, what has been called for repeatedly is that the Attorney General should review the advice he gave the Prime Minister, which the Attorney General has repeatedly said is confidential, but in fact on 17<sup>th</sup> March the Attorney General advised Parliament himself in answer to a written question on the legality of the war. He gave his own advice to Parliament on the legality of the war and that was in a written question and it is in Hansard of the UK Commons. The carfuffle, the political issues in the UK, are that he should disclose the confidential advice that he gave the Prime Minister and all the preliminary issues that he considers in that respect, but if the Chief Minister needs other authorities to be persuaded, in 1963 in Hansard it is established by Sir Harold Wilson that it is the duty of the Attorney General to advise the House on legal matters, a duty going beyond his responsibility to this Government and the Crown. So, on that basis, I think it is clear beyond peradventure that the Attorney General is above and beyond everything else the legal adviser to this Parliament, and therefore Opposition Members are entitled to ask the question of the Attorney General 'is x, y or z legal?', in exactly the same terms as the question put to him on 10<sup>th</sup> March, which he accepted he should answer and he did answer on 17<sup>th</sup> March, 'was the war in Iraq legal?', and he answered that positively.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not accept that what the hon Member is saying is the position simply because he asserts it, and simply because he quotes from two unspecified and un-notified quotations from Harold Wilson. Look, if it were a constitutional position it would not require the political Prime Minister of the day to say it. Frankly, if this hon Member wants to establish whether for the purposes of this House the Attorney General is the adviser of the House, then he has to establish it other than by quoting from press clippings in Question Time. He has got plenty of opportunities, he can bring substantive motions on the question, he can do whatever he likes but the idea that he reads from a newspaper article and then he says 'and then it must be true because I am reading it from a newspaper article', he can hardly expect me to accept it on that basis.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not asking the Chief Minister to accept it on that basis, in fact wherever I have read from I have actually referred him to the Hansards in questions of the House of Commons, and perhaps all we should do is go back and in time for the debate that we are going to have on the regulation, ensure that both the Government and the Opposition have come to a fixed view as to whether that in fact is what is established, which I am very clearly of the view it is, so that the Attorney General's duty when we come to debate the regulation is not an issue for debate as of itself, but certainly I would have thought that the position of the Government has been made clear. That is, that the Attorney General has three duties and none of them is to this Parliament. What I would ask is that the Chief Minister go back, look at the references which I have given him, which are in Hansard and I am happy to give him outside this House again, so that he can review that position in time for the debate.

**MR SPEAKER:**

What does Erskine May say?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Erskine May is silent on the issue, it does not actually address what the duties of any of the parties are in the Parliament. It says what the historical role of the Speaker is et cetera, but as Mr Speaker is fully aware, a lot of Parliamentary procedure is established through the debates and not necessarily contained in the rule book. But I think that we have to look at the substance of the answers given by the Attorney General and come to a very fixed view.

**ORAL**

**NO. 484 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**RETIRED FIRE OFFICERS**

Can Government state if they have now taken a policy decision in respect of representations they have received from retired Senior Fire Officers regarding revalued backdated pay and pension?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 484 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government give a timescale by which they expect to look at this issue and take a policy decision?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for the Chief Minister to say whether this is something they are going to look at at all?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it is being looked at and has been looked at but I cannot give the hon Member an indication as to when the Government may come to a decision about it. The hon Member should distinguish between looking at something and making a decision about it. They are not synonymous things.

**NO. 485 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state if there has been any further response to the current offer for sale of Government 50 per cent share of the co-ownership homes with a 5 per cent uplift, giving the same breakdown as was given in answer to Question 2388 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The latest offer closed on 31 October 2004 and late completions were allowed until 31 December 2004. Since the answer to Question No. 2388 of 2004 there have been 41 new completions. The schedule which I hand the hon Member provides a breakdown of the information that he has requested.

**Answer to Question 485**

**Sale of Government share of the current co-ownership scheme**

Estate	Completions in the period from Q2388/2004 to date		Total completions to date	
	No. of completions	Proceeds £	No. of completions	Proceeds £
Brympton	1	28,800	9	241,977
Harbour Views	14	285,643	49	943,568
Montagu Crescent	4	94,524	19	517,265
Montagu Gardens	12	317,846	28	770,766
Sir William Jackson Grove	4	71,810	18	411,416
Westview Park	6	132,200	18	395,067
	<b>41</b>	<b>£930,824</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>£3,280,058</b>

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 485 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What is the position of anybody wanting to buy them after the closing of the last offer? Does it go back to the original system that there was before these offers were made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There was not an original system.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well people have always had an option to buy out the Government share, from day one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well people have always had the option yes, but remember this was a reduced formula. The Government have actually not considered what they would do in those circumstances, the offer has closed and nobody has put in a request. It may be possible that the Government from time to time will re-open windows but we have to be careful if we re-open windows in the future, that there has to be some penalty because otherwise we are being unfair to the people who exercise their choices earlier. So every time the Government re-open a window there has to be a tightening of the terms otherwise we are just failing to recompense the people who exercised the choice originally. So I am not ruling out that there will be some further Government schemes in the future but we would have to think very carefully about the terms that that would be on. In the meantime, yes, I suppose there is, I suppose the hon Member is right, people were always free to come to the Government and say 'I will buy you out on these terms', but I think from memory that the Government's commitment to buy at a given annual percentage has expired. I think that only lasted nine or ten years, from memory, and that the Government could now demand to sell their share at market value. That would be, I think, the technical position which is why I suspect so many of these people opted to buy.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact I assume that the change from 4 to 5 per cent that took place from the first offer to the second offer is a reflection of what the Government have just said about tightening it a little bit when going out again. Is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

**ORAL**

**NO. 486 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – THE SANDS**

Can Government now state how many tenders have been received for the Housing Project on the site commonly known as 'The Sands' by North Mole Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Given that a construction contract has not yet been signed, it is commercially inappropriate to provide this information publicly. But I am happy to tell the hon Member privately and confidentially. As soon as a contract is signed the information can then be given publicly.

ORAL

NO. 487 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government state whether a new contract with Land Property Services is now in place?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Although the main Heads of Terms have been agreed, in principle, the final contract with Land Property Services Ltd has not yet been finalised. This is expected to be ready shortly.

**NO. 488 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**POLICE AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT 1984**

Have Government made any progress in respect of their consideration of the possibility of implementation of the Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not a question of progress, I interpret the question to mean have Government considered the implementation of the report. The answer is yes, Government have studied the original report and met with the authors to discuss their recommendations. We are awaiting further input from the authors, commissioned from them in that meeting and it is Government's hope that they will be in a position to bring legislation to this House later this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 488 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that the report of 5<sup>th</sup> October, maybe not of 5<sup>th</sup> October but received by the Chief Minister on 5<sup>th</sup> October, which is as he told me in his last answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. I have only had one report. There may now be another as a follow-up, but yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

When was the meeting with the authors held, which led to the request for further information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I could not tell the hon Member the date without notice of the question but several months ago.



**NO. 489 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES OMBUDSMAN**

What progress, if any, has been made by the Government in relation to the possibility of establishing a Financial Services Ombudsman since the last answer in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are not working on this possibility at this time, and therefore the question of progress does not arise.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 489 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is really the nature of the answer that I was given in Question No. 1913 of 2004 but I was told that that might change. I reminded the Chief Minister then, in October, that the answer he had given in answer to Question No. 446 of 2004 was actually considerably different to the answer and expectation raised by his answer to Question No. 1913 of 2004. In fact in answer to Question No. 446 of 2004 the Chief Minister was speaking in terms of we will have a financial services ombudsman, the only issue is who is going to pay for it, we will find out when we get there in terms of what powers he had or he was going to have. Can I ask the Chief Minister what it is that has changed his attitude to the implementation of this office?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, no he cannot because I do not accept the premise of his question. I do not accept that there has been any change nor do I accept that he has correctly summarised the import of my previous answers. I certainly remember telling him that the Government had in principle no objection to a Financial Services Ombudsman and recognised that indeed it may be a valuable addition to our Finance Centre. I certainly also remember telling him that there was certainly an issue in the Government's mind about how it would be financed, which had not been resolved, so he cannot convert whatever he chooses to draw by way of expectations from my words and he cannot convert those expectations into Government commitments. How he chooses to interpret my remarks and the degree of expectation that he chooses to raise in his own mind is not something that I can answer for. The position

that I have told him in the past is as I have just told him now in the last 30 seconds. However, what I am telling him today is the answer to his question. He does not ask what is the Government's view on the possibility of establishing an Ombudsman, he has asked me what progress, if any, have the Government made in relation to bringing one about and I am telling him that no progress has been made because the question of progress does not arise, because at the moment at this time, as the answer says, it is not being worked on. That might change but if he asks me what progress is being made on something that the Government are not engaged in at all, the answer can only be at this time the issue of progress does not arise because it is not being worked on. That is the answer. If he asks me well what view do the Government have on a Financial Services Ombudsman and do the Government think it is a good, bad or mediocre idea?, I would then give him the views that indeed I have just given him in answer to supplementaries, from which he would presumably recall and recollect the answers that I have always given him on this.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Except of course I am not just summarising his previous answers in a way that might be self-serving. In fact, on page 781 of the Hansard for the First Session of 2004 in answer to Question No. 446, he said, and I accept that this was not part of his prepared answer and we were debating across the floor of the House but he did say this, *'I would expect our Financial Services Ombudsman, when we have one, to be the same sort of creature with the same sort of powers and roles as is the norm in the UK, which is what we did with our Public Services Ombudsman. We got all the legislation from comparable territories, we based ours on Malta, New Zealand and Ireland, primarily to make sure that we were doing more or less what everyone was doing, and I assume we will do the same for the Financial Services Ombudsman too'*. Now when we finished that Question Time, I was very encouraged by the Chief Minister's attitude who had then answered a question of mine prefaced with 'will the Government create and establish the office of Financial Services Ombudsman?'. In his answer last time in Question No. 1913 of 2004, he gave a different impression saying there was nobody senior in Government involved, there might be somebody junior beavering away at it, there were lots of requests for things that Government might consider were good ideas but this was not going to be something that they were going to initiate themselves at this stage. It might change he said, that is why I asked whether there was any progress, and has it changed and I assume from what he has said that the answer is no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly, I could have just said no there is no progress but that would have given him the false impression that it is being worked on and that there is no progress because we are stuck on issues. There is no progress because there is no work being done on it and that is what the answer is. If he asks me next time and still no work has been done, I would have to tell him the same thing. If on the other hand next time he asks me there has been some work done on it then that is what the answer will reflect but the answer does not address the substance of whether the Government are going to do one, are not going to do one, think it is a bad idea, think it is a good idea et cetera. That is the point.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, I appreciate that. Clearly I think there was agreement across the floor of the House that it would be a good idea. What I am saying is that in the first answer the Chief Minister gave me the impression that it was a good idea and that it was going to happen and that now we have moved to a stage where it is unlikely to happen or at least it is not at the top of the agenda for things to happen. Perhaps the next question will be this: Is it not at the top of the agenda because the issue of costs has been determined in a way that is going to require this House to fund it, and it is not going to be funded by the industry?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, there is no specific reason why it is not being worked on or is not on the agenda. Certainly, the hon Member says it would be a good idea, well that depends on how it pans out. I do not think it is a good idea that the taxpayer should constantly take on its shoulder the financing of activities that in other countries are financed directly or indirectly by the industry. But that issue has not arisen because the Government have not consulted anybody about it and no one has had the opportunity to say whether they think it is a good idea that they should fund it or that it is not a good idea. So the answer to his last supplementary is no, neither that nor any other specific substantive issue in relation to the model is the cause why there is no progress.

ORAL

**NO. 490 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BETTING INDUSTRY**

Can Government say how many persons are employed in the betting industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by company and by nationality, showing how many are Gibraltarian, as at 30 June 2004 and 31 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This data has not been compiled for the specific dates requested, but is available as at 1 April 2005 and 30 September 2004. As at 1 April 2005 a total of 1,107 persons were employed by 15 companies, this is based on information supplied by the gaming operators themselves. This compares to 950 employed by 14 companies on 30 September 2004. I hand the hon Member the information.

# OFFSHORE GAMING COMPANIES - EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2004

## Answer to Question 490

Ladbrokes (Gibraltar) Limited  
Victor Chandler (International) Limited  
BAW International Limited  
Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited  
Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited  
St Minver Limited  
Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited  
Carmen Media Group Limited  
(Formerly Demmysportsbet .com Ltd)  
Digibet Limited  
Eurobet (Gibraltar) Limited  
Globet.com Group Limited  
International Betting Association Limited \*  
Bay Management Limited  
Mansion (Gibraltar) Limited

<u>Gibraltarian</u>	<u>Other British</u>	<u>Spanish</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
15	42	4	1	62
69	174	13	54	310
12	15	3	18	48
6	76	0	7	89
3	11	0	1	15
4	18	0	3	25
63	118	6	89	276
22	15	2	11	50
0	2	1	1	4
1	1	1	7	10
0	1	0	3	4
0	0	0	0	0
5	5	1	14	25
5	11	0	16	32
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>950</b>

\* In process of recruitment

Source : Office of the Financial & Development Secretary

Contd.....

**OFFSHORE GAMING COMPANIES - EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS AS AT 1 APRIL 2005**

**Contd Answer to Question 490**

	<u>Gibraltarian</u>	<u>Other British</u>	<u>Spanish</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ladbrokes (Gibraltar) Limited	16	44	4	1	65
Victor Chandler (International) Limited	69	172	16	59	316
BAW International Limited	12	17	3	25	57
Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited	7	91	1	7	106
Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited	4	16	0	1	21
St Minver Limited	6	23	0	8	37
Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited	55	116	8	70	249
Carmen Media Group Limited (Formerly Demmysportsbet .com Ltd)	22	15	2	9	48
Digibet Limited	0	2	1	1	4
Eurobet (Gibraltar) Limited	0	1	0	4	5
Globet.com Group Limited	0	1	0	5	6
International Betting Association Limited	2	0	1	2	5
Electraworks Limited (Formerly Bay Management Limited)	29	43	4	31	107
Mansion (Gibraltar) Limited	5	31	1	36	73
Futuresbetting.com Limited	1	7	0	0	8
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>1107</b>

Source : Office of the Financial & Development Secretary

**NO. 491 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SALE OF S/Y PERKEO**

Have the proceeds of sale of the S/Y “Perkeo” sold by auction on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004 now been earmarked or ring fenced exclusively for investment in respect of law enforcement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As I already informed the hon Member in answer to Question No. 1972 of 2004, S/Y “Perkeo” was not sold by auction as the reserve price was not met. It was subsequently sold by private sale for £81,579. The proceeds were credited to the Consolidated Fund.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 491 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact, in answer to Question No. 2413 we also dealt with this issue and the Chief Minister had told me then that no decision had yet been made, this I think was December 2004. As to the use of the funds, once they are in the Consolidated Fund I imagine there is no longer any possibility of them being ring fenced for law enforcement, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, except to the extent that the Consolidated Fund finances law enforcement.

**NO. 492 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES**

When will the Government be publishing and circulating information on what procedures citizens should follow in the event of an environmental emergency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A booklet which provides the public with general advice in the event of a major incident, including an environmental emergency, has been compiled. It is proposed to publish the booklet shortly. I cannot tell the hon Member exactly when.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 492 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is not a million miles from where we were when the Chief Minister answered Question No. 1975 of 2004. He told me then that he expected that he would be able to do it before the end of the year 2004 and Question No. 1975 was answered in October. We are now five months almost into this year, it was not done before the end of last year and has not been done yet. Can I ask the Chief Minister whether 'shortly' in his answer means before the end of this term, before the summer or are we looking at the second part of next year or is there not yet any possibility of telling us when?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot honestly give him an accuracy of when. The hon Member can ask the Government's view of things and he can be critical of the Government if he wants to for not doing things as quickly as he would want to but he cannot convert himself into the Government's time keeper in respect of our policies. In respect of our policies we do them when we either want to do, or when we can do them, very often it is not a matter of choice, it is a question of prioritisation of resources, legislative and drafting time. My understanding is that there is now a draft available for final consideration. I dare not give him a more accurate indication. I would be very surprised if it was not published this year. It is possible that it will be published before the summer. So I dare not say to him 3 weeks or 4 weeks because it may not be 3 or 4 weeks and then he will be holding me to the time table, or he will be trying to hold me to the time table. So the answer is that this is something which could emerge in the next month



or two or could wait until after the summer. As I say, the long stop is that I cannot think of any reason, given that the draft is already at such an advanced stage, why it should certainly not be out before the end of the year and I would expect it to be out much sooner than the end of the year.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister by way of further supplementary, what the problem is with the booklet at this stage? Is it that it has had to go through more drafts than expected, who is it with, is it with him for review or with another body?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well lots of people have had an input. I think that the position right now is that it has come back to my office and it is awaiting our input and our confirmation as to content. Yes, I think that is now the position.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In those circumstances if it is with the Chief Minister, I suppose in his capacity of whatever the Cobra equivalent in Gibraltar is, and he has this bunker there under No 6 Convent Place, can I urge him please to ensure that this is towards the top of his agenda because it is something that obviously causes some people a lot of concern and could be very important in the unlikely event, I hope, that we ever were to have an environmental emergency, although I do not know whether people would be reaching for the booklet if we do.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the fact that it is now with me does not mean that it will not require further modifications as a result of being seen by me, but of course the possibility for environmental catastrophes did not arise for the first time on 16 May 1996, and previous Governments did not think that in order to satisfy the concerns of those people who may be concerned that the way to satisfy them is to put out a booklet. Now, I accept that with the passage of time the way in which societies gear up for accidents and emergencies changes, and it may be that in the 1980s there was not the same awareness, public consciousness as there is now, because of terrorism and other things. I accept that expectations move on but if the hon Member has looked at the one that the UK issued he will see that, I mean we should not make too much fuss, at the end of the day it deals with some quite banal things like making sure one has a torch at home and if there is an explosion do not please run in the direction of the explosion, run in the opposite direction. Well I like to think that most people in Gibraltar are sensible enough not to need to be told that. So we must not either create the impression that this pamphlet when it is issued will sort of be the panacea that will provide, miraculously, a sort of defensive and protective shield around the community. It actually is, if he has seen the one in the United Kingdom, it is best described perhaps by his last rhetorical question just before he sat down, which is not a reason for not publishing one but nor should we exaggerate the effect and value and the practical purpose. Most of it is common sense.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Let me start where the Chief Minister started. I do not think it is fair to go for the 1996 get out of jail free card. If it was not done by 1996 how dare one press me to do it, I have only been in Government for almost 10 years, I think that is unfair. Let us get to the substance of this issue. I note that the Chief Minister rises to criticise the first two GSLP administrations with an ease and a disposition that he does not really lend to his criticisms of the AACR administrations before then. It may be that he does not want to offend those who might have been linked to those administrations or that he feels free to offend those of us who are associated with the GSLP, but so be it. The nub of the issue here is fairly narrow and we should not allow partisan concerns to enter this debate, and I am sorry to say that I think it is the Chief Minister who threw the first stone in that respect. These booklets, although they may seem banal to him and to me to an extent, to an extent because we need to know what different areas of Gibraltar we need to be going to if an explosion were in the south, where in the north should we congregate, what are the procedures that are in place in the event of a major emergency, are issues that are important. Both of us will agree on that. Environmentally and because of terrorism and for a number of other reasons these things have become more important and continue to become more important, and that is why I urge him please despite his remarks to ensure that it is at the top of his agenda, if at all possible.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I can agree with the last bit of what he said but on the politics of it I really cannot agree with the hon Member so let us amuse ourselves with a bit of banter. There is no point asking rhetorically as he just did, well why does he offend the GSLP, why does he not refer back to the AACR? Why is he picking on us poor GSLP, oppressed GSLP Members of the House? I would have thought the answer to his question was so perfectly obvious that I am surprised that he made the point. The AACR do not stand in this House today criticising this Government for not doing things, or not doing things quickly enough that they did not think was important enough to do at all during the years that they were in office. I do not say to the hon Members that because they did not do something when they were in office that they are not free politically or in any other sense to demand that we do it, but I think it is relevant and the hon Members cannot escape this, and he can call it a 'get out of jail free' card when he likes, I think that is a wholly inappropriate analogy, he cannot escape from the reality that the position that the hon Members adopted on a particular question, not this one necessarily, when they were in office, the extent to which they attached importance to that question when they were in office, the extent to which they bothered to deal with the issue when they were in office, is a relevant consideration to take into account when assessing the credibility of the views that they express on it when they demand that we do it. It does not disentitle them from demanding, it does not disentitle them from being the watchdog or the time keeper or whatever he wants to call it in relation to it, but it is a perfectly legitimate device for the Government to say, 'well hang on chaps, do not be quite so demanding of us. In other words, do not make the issue so important now than you attached importance to it when you were in Government and when you were in a position to do something about it'. I see that I am not alone in this because I see that in the United Kingdom Parliament I often come across Mr Blair and other members of his Government reminding the Conservatives of what they did when they were in office, or what they did not do when they were in office. It is perfectly legitimate. It does not address ones entitlement to do it now. As Members of the House of Assembly today, Opposition Members are entitled to hold the Government to account on each and

every issue that they please regardless of what their position was when they were in Government, but it is equally true that in terms of the political response, as opposed to the factual response, in terms of the political response to the questions we are entitled to draw the distinction between the Opposition's position on an issue now and the Opposition's performance on that issue when they were in Government. I do not think that the hon Member is being fair when he describes that as causing offence to the GSLP as opposed to causing offence to the AACR. It is not causing offence, it is the normal political rough and tumble, which we have not invented in Gibraltar, and that is what political process is. Of course it is not just the Opposition that can practice political process, the Government can take part in the political process as well so I do not see it as offending the GSLP as opposed to the AACR. If there was somebody from the AACR here doing the same thing we would say the same things. Of course we cannot do it to the Liberal Party because of course they have not been in office before, so when it comes to the Liberal Party we are limited to saying 'the party with which you are now in an alliance and the party whose manifesto you tore up', we can say all that but we cannot say 'when you were in office'. So I would urge the hon Member please not to be so sensitive, it is not a question of causing him offence, it is just a question of the politics of the matter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister can rest assured that my sensitivities are not offended. I have a very thick skin. He and I know that a lot of what we say when we use the word 'offence' does not mean offence of a personal nature. I am not one of those that will take it that way, whatever our debates may be and however acrimonious they may get on the issues, whenever we get outside this door, as far as I am concerned, no offence is taken. That is what we are here for but one of the things that is important when dealing with a Government that has been in office now for nine and a half years is to say 'well look, Gentlemen, you have been in office for nine and a half years, you are responsible for the state of Gibraltar today'. Of course that Government can turn around and say 'yes and look at all the brownie points we believe the people of Gibraltar should give us as a result and why they invest us and continue to invest us with their confidence'. But if they do that, if they rely on their nine and a half years in office as their badge of achievement they must also accept that they have had longer in office today than the GSLP had between 1988 and 1996. So they are, in my view and it is simply this point that I make, responsible for the state in which we find ourselves in today. Now, as an Opposition, we will say 'well look, these aspects of our society still need a lot of work, you are neglecting them et cetera., that is our role and they will say 'well look, these aspects of our society have improved dramatically in this way and that way'. That is the cut and thrust, the rough and tumble of our political debate but on this question where we are really talking about an environmental booklet, I think we have done it to death. As long as it comes out quickly I will buy my copy.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I agree with the hon Member's analysis but not with the conclusions that he draws. I agree that the Government are responsible for things that we have chosen not to do in eight or nine years, just as we are responsible for the things that they have done. The fact that the Opposition did not do it when they were in office in no way relieves the Government of their duty to account for the fact that they may not have done it either. That is not what I was saying. What I was saying to the hon Member is that when he says 'why have you not done this?'. Look, take for example the question of

the Financial Services Ombudsman, the Finance Centre, much as it has improved and prospered since we have been in office, did not actually start when we were in office. So, if he asks me every three months why is there not a Financial Services Ombudsman? When is it going to be done? Why is there no more progress? He is attaching a degree of importance to it that his own party did not attach to it when they were in Government in a position to have introduced a Financial Services Ombudsman and they gave it no importance. That is the point that I am making, not that the fact that they did it or did not do it relieves the Government of their duty as Government today. I fully accept his analysis in that respect, but that does not mean that when the Opposition Members are castigating Government or criticising Government, or holding Government to account on a basis which is so hugely different, on a particular issue I am not talking now about this environmental matter, but hugely different to their attitude and position when they were in Government, it is legitimate for the Government to say 'well yes, we do have a plan to put an Ombudsman or to do this and to do that, but look get off my back because when you guys had the chance to do it you chose not to do it'. That is the only point that I am making which is a slightly different analysis and of course, the reason why I have taken some time to go into this issue into a somewhat detailed and extended basis, is that I detected in the hon Members, they almost poo poo whenever the Government remind them of their own record on something, they say 'why do you keep on looking backwards and not forwards?'. The reason why we look backwards and not forward is for the reasons that I have explained. The hon Members cannot when exercising critical judgement from the Opposition benches, think that they are entitled to be given the credit for having no record in Government themselves. It is just not a realistic expectation on the hon Members' part, which is not to be confused with the question of whether the Government are relieved or not relieved of the responsibility today, which I acknowledge and accept from him is clearly vested in us regardless of how bad their record might have been when they were last in office.

**NO. 493 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES – CONFERENCES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the months of January to March 2005, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Finance Centre in conjunction with The Society of Trust & Estate Practitioners (STEP) held a Private Clients Seminar in Manchester on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2005.

The Government delegation consisted of:

Mr James Tipping	Finance Centre Director
Mr Joseph Macano	Director Licensing Unit
Mrs Sabrina Ramagge	Executive Officer
Mr Marcus Killick	Commissioner – Financial Services Commission

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:-

Flights and Accommodation	£1,170.00
Travel Expenses	£ 722.15
Seminar Costs	<u>£1,350.00</u>
Total	£3,242.15

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 493 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that the only conference identified for that period?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, on financial services yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister would not have the cost with him of attending the conference in Philadelphia which occurred, I think, in April and is therefore not covered by the principal question, but if he has it as a further titbit to provide I would be grateful for it and save myself asking next time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have glanced at the back of my hand and it just happens not to be written there. I am afraid I have not got the answer.

ORAL

**NO. 494 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the months of January to March 2005 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 495 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 495 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies were registered in Gibraltar in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are not aware of any pending applications and no Protected Cell Companies were registered in the months of January to March 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 496 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 497 and 498 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 497 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates have been issued in the months of January to March 2005 stating how many were issued before and how many after the coming into effect of the new arrangements required by the EU Commission as part of its state aid investigation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 496 and 498 of 2005.

**NO. 498 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many companies are presently awaiting the grant of exempt status dependent on the maximum number allowed under the new arrangements required by the EU Commission as part of its state aid investigation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 496**

The number of tax exempt companies which have terminated their tax exempt certificates total 190. This figure is made up as follows:

January	55
February	53
March	82

“Termination” is interpreted as being companies which have returned their certificate and no longer require their tax exempt status.

**Answer to Question No. 497**

There were 491 tax exempt certificates issued in the months of January to March 2005, out of which 464 were issued before and 45 after the commencement of the appropriate measures conditions.

**Answer to Question No. 498**

There are about 832 companies awaiting the granting of exempt status.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 496 TO 498 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister tell us what criteria is being used for the grant of certificates to those 832? Is it simply a list system or are there other criteria related to the creation

of employment et cetera? I have heard in the industry discussion of such criteria but I do not know that it is objectively available.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is not a quota system. The system is still being refined because of course it is a learning curve for everybody. We had no idea what the demand would be, indeed we do not know how much of these is just built up over a period of time, because of course there has been a suspension of applications for more than just a day, so this figure carries back, it has got to be audited because some of these demands might have gone away but the applications have not been formally withdrawn. So the system for managing the quota that we are allowed to issue will be developed as and when it goes along. Of course the Government are concerned not to create a sort of a grey market in these things. If there is more demand than supply, which would be good news, because it would mean that despite the difficulties the Finance Centre is continuing to attract business, the question then arises whether it is in a position to satisfy that demand. That said, some criteria have already been put in place for deciding, the principal one of which is that priority should be given to exemption certificates for economic activities by the certificate applicant. So for example, if there was a contest between a certificate required by a financial services provider, a bank, an insurance company, fund manager, something which is itself a substantive economic activity in its own right, that would get priority to an application on behalf of Mr Smith for his private investment company, on the basis that that does not generate as much employment in Gibraltar and economic activity. But it is very early days and of course a lot of this demand will be satisfied because traditionally, come the 1<sup>st</sup> April, a lot of people forfeit their exemption certificate by not paying the tax due. So that is the opportunity in the year when there is the largest amount of vacancies created and I cannot tell him, unfortunately, because the information has not been provided to me of how many have gone. I do have the information actually, 810 companies forfeited their exempt status on 1<sup>st</sup> April for non-payment of the tax, so most of the cases outstanding at the end of March could be dealt with. We now have to apply to the 810 that have forfeited their certificate on 1<sup>st</sup> April, the Finance Centre now has to calculate by the application of the rule, how many of those can be re-issued, then there has got to be an assessment of the 832 applications, they have got to be given and a small margin have got to be kept back for urgent applications between now and the next forfeiture because it would be terrible if somebody came up saying they would like to set up an insurance operation and ask for an exempt certificate and being told that they have to wait until somebody goes out of the revolving door. So we are always going to keep a small batch for the major economic activity. That is how the system is.

ORAL

**NO. 499 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 500 and 504 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 500 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 499 and 504 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 501 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 502 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 502 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached table.



**Answer to Question 502**

**Answer to Question 501**

Persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

Month	No. of Employers	No. of Employees	Gib	Other British	Spanish	Moroccan	Other EEC	Other Non-EEC
January-05	32	235	133	82	15	0	3	2
February-05	31	230	130	78	15	0	5	2
March-05	31	232	132	78	15	0	5	2

**Answer to Question 502**

Persons employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

Month	No. of Employers	No. of Employees	Gib	Other British	Spanish	Moroccan	Other EEC	Other Non-EEC
January-05	15	662	473	106	33	2	46	2
February-05	15	672	477	109	33	2	49	2
March-05	15	683	486	109	36	2	47	3

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 501 AND 502 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister, I ask him this question because it relates to parts of the financial services industry. I assume that the information comes principally from the Employment Service and not from any part of his Ministry which relates to financial services and he has answered it because it is financial services and I think Mr Azopardi used to answer before. Would it be appropriate for me to direct this question to the Minister for Employment, with whom I have an arrangement, as it is statistical information which can be provided as part of that arrangement also, because it is employment and not necessarily financial services?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, he could only do that if indeed the source is the Employment Service and I cannot be sure that it is. Unlike the previous question the answer to which prompted me to say that it was provided, the gaming question that his Colleague asked, I cannot confirm to him what the source of this information is, whether it is the Employment service or the industry. If it is the industry then the Employment service would not have the information. If it is the Employment service then of course they do have the information and he is free to ask the Minister if he wants to.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I write to him, then perhaps we can determine that afterwards? Perhaps that might be the easiest way.

**NO. 503 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new banking licences have been issued in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There have been no new banking licences issued in the months of January to March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 503 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister will recall that this Question used to be phrased in terms of whether applications for banking licences had been received, rather than licences issued. In fact, it was answered like that to the Hon Dr Garcia by his predecessor and to me by him on a number of occasions in this House, until the answer to Question No. 1946 of 2004 where it became apparent that the Commissioner for Financial Services had decided that it was not appropriate that the information be given. As a result, the Chief Minister told us that he did not share the view of the Financial Services Commission in that respect, in the decision no longer to provide the information and that he was going to raise the issue with him. I would be grateful if the Chief Minister could tell me whether he has raised the issue with the Financial Services Commissioner and whether in future we will once again receive an answer to that question in this House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The matter remains on the agenda for a meeting that has not yet taken place between me and the Financial Services Commissioner. Let me say that I find it wholly unacceptable that the Government of Gibraltar should not be provided with this information by the Financial Services Commissioner. If he does not agree to vary his position then the Government will give serious consideration to introducing legislation requiring him to do so. It is not acceptable for any part of the public administration, however independent of Government it may be, refuses to provide information to the Government which is relevant to the macro-economic management and assessment and evaluation of the economy of Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

May I press the Chief Minister that in the event that we were to get to the stage where the Government once more are able to have that information, because as he did tell us and is reflected in his answer, it is also the Government that are no longer receiving the information. Once the Government are again in receipt of it, the Government will revert to the practice of answering the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course, we are only not providing it now because we have not got it ourselves. If the hon Member asks the question and we have the information he will get it.

ORAL

**NO. 504 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many companies have been redomiciled out of Gibraltar in each month from January to the end of March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member seeks is on the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 504**

**Answer to Question 499**

The following companies were removed from the Companies Register in the months of January to March 2005.

January	225
February	161
March	318

**Answer to Question 500**

The following companies were formed in the months of January to March 2005.

January	317
February	284
March	166

**Answer to Question 504**

The following Companies have lodged applications for consent to re-domicile out of Gibraltar in the months from January to March 2005.

The Registrar gives consent 30 days after the notice is issued and consent is given almost without exception.

January	127
February	27
March	40

**ORAL**

**NO. 505 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of each of the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 506 and 507 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 506 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status in Gibraltar in each month from January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 505 and 507 of 2005.



**NO. 507 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status in each month of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In the months of January to March 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status:-

January	0
February	6
March	2

In the months of January to March 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status:-

January	5
February	4
March	4

In the months of January to March 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status:-

January	1
February	1
March	1

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 505 TO 507 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In respect of Categories 3 and 4, does the Chief Minister have the information to tell me how many of those, if any, were Gibraltarians?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the hon Member suggesting, which may or may not be the case, that some of them might be Gibraltarians? I know that we have extended status to one or two individual post holders, for example, but I am not presently aware that we have given Category 3 or 4 status to any Gibraltarian. It may have happened, is that what he is after?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am under the impression that there are more than two, as I understand it, Gibraltarians who have either Category 3 or Category 4 status. I know that for example there are post holders in the Government who do, not necessarily Gibraltarians. For example, the Chief Executive Officer of the GHA is either Category 3 or 4 but he is not a Gibraltarian, but I think there are a number of Gibraltarians who have this status. One of them actually is also a post holder in the Government and he is one of the persons of whom I ask questions about frequently in relation to one of the portfolios that the Chief Minister has. Has there been any new Gibraltarian in these months.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would have to check, I have not got that information. If the hon Member writes to me I will give it to him.

**NO. 508 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TEP's**

Will the Government now state what answers they have provided to the Committee of the TEP Plan Association and/or their solicitors in respect of their request for assistance in pursuit of the claims of these parties and what action the Government are taking or have taken, if any, in pursuance of the said issues?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are in on-going discussions with the TEP Plan Association and their solicitors and it is not appropriate to give the hon Member an account of on-going discussions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 508 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just tell the Chief Minister that if it were to become necessary as a result of the conclusion of those discussions to bring legislation to this House for any purpose, certainly he will be able to count with the support of the Opposition in respect of the issues that I understand may be considered in that respect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am grateful to the hon Member for his open cheque book offer of supporting the Government in whatever legislation they wish to bring on this matter. I am grateful to him for that indication. It may well need legislation.

**NO. 509 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CIVIL SERVANTS**

Will the Government state whether they allow any civil servants to stay in employment over the age of 60?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, exceptionally.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 509 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In dealing with those exceptions what criteria do the Government apply to their decision-making?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the most typical case would be when inadequate succession planning would result in a gap in availability of experience, knowledge and expertise upon the retirement of a particular officer. On the industrial side, I think on some occasions the Government have exercised some latitude when allowing an officer to serve for a bit longer would have carried him across or to the end of a personal financial requirement, like children finishing university in June 'please can I stay until June?', that sort of thing.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So it is very much on an ad-hoc basis that this criteria is applied. There is no objective criteria which is in writing and which I could have a copy of and things like that, it is ad-hoc.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because it is very exceptional. I think there have only been two or three cases that I am personally aware of. Well, they all come to my office, not necessarily to me

but to the Chief Secretary at least. I think there have only been two or three cases in the nine years that we have been in this job, that I am aware of.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the industrial workers have the option to either go at 65 or 60?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Non-industrial staff must go at 60 and may go at 55. Industrial staff must go at 65 and may go at 60.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister in answering my question referred to the criteria applied to industrial staff and to non-industrial staff. Am I therefore to assume that the exceptions in respect of the industrial staff would only kick in when asking to stay on after 65 not 60?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 510 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AIR MILES**

What is the Government's policy on the use by Ministers of "Executive Club" miles accumulated by them when flying on Government business with British Airways?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

We have not formulated any policy in relation to this matter and the system in place is therefore still the one operating when we arrived in office in May 1996, which by the way applies to everybody, Ministers and everybody else that are publicly funded to fly, and that is that the Government do not take the view that this is a public asset. In other words, the Government do not control this in any way. I have recently been told that in fact that practice has changed in the UK where it used to be so some time back and that now in the UK, since they changed their practice several years ago, air miles earned on journeys paid for with tax payers funds can only be redeemed when travelling on official business. But that has never been the practice in Gibraltar and is not the practice now.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 510 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand in any event that the air miles system came into effect after 1996. Be that as it may, the Executive Club air miles system came into play after 1996, I think in 1998. In its present incarnation certainly, it may be that there was a precursor of it which also allowed the accumulation of miles. Does it not make sense that if the tax payer is funding the ticket that gives rise to the miles, it should be the tax payer that is entitled to redeem it? Perhaps the Chief Minister could tell us whether in fact any of his Ministers have travelled privately using air miles accumulated when paid for by the tax payer, and whether he will look into changing that policy so that there is a very clear policy from now on, and I accept that there might not have been guidance to prevent that in the past, from now on so that we adopt the attitude in the United Kingdom that if the tax payer has paid for the ticket that has given rise to the miles, the tax payer should take advantage of those miles as well.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, taking his first point first, the hon Member is wrong when he says that the Executive air miles system was introduced in 1996. It is extraordinary how everything starts in May 1996, air miles, MRSA, everything starts on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 which is rather peculiar. I do not know where the hon Member gets the view that air miles, in fact from personal memory I can tell him that when I was.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. Just to make it easier for the Chief Minister, I am not talking about air miles, he must not fall into the trap about talking about air miles because air miles are one particular type of frequent flyer mile and they are accumulated in many different ways. We are talking about Executive Club miles with British Airways and the One World Alliance which are different, and I think those are the ones that came into existence, I am not saying on 17<sup>th</sup> May 1996 I think it was actually after that, but not air miles although they have the same effect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think anything in terms of what we call them, I assume that the hon Member's whole point relates to whatever it is called, whatever the scheme is, however it develops, he is referring to the mechanism whereby if one flies with an airline they give free miles that are then accumulated, and if he calls them Executive Club air miles it does not really matter. What he is asking me is, and it is a perfectly proper question, when Ministers and other public officials for that matter I suppose he means to include, earn air miles by virtue of journeys undertaken which have been paid for by the tax payer, who gets the benefit of the free travel for which those air miles can be redeemed? Is it the tax payer or is it the person that flew to earn them? If that is what he means, which is what I had assumed he means, he is wrong to suggest that that started in May 1996 because as I was about to explain to him when he got up to try and correct me, I well remember when I was the Leader of the Opposition flying to the Bahamas with the then Minister for Government Services and having to deviate to some desk or other because he wanted to check whether his air miles had been punched in to the card. So he is not right, I know he is not right and there are instances to demonstrate that he is not right. That said, the issue of whether air miles should only be, in other words whether we should now like the UK has done, make this one of those things which would be an indirect financial benefit from tax payers funds is moot for debate. Ultimately, it is not so much a matter of Government policy, the Government could adopt a policy politically against it but actually it is a matter for the Principal Auditor to decide whether it is a proper or an improper use of public funds. To my knowledge the Principal Auditor has neither before or after 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 expressed a view on this issue one way or the other. Whether that is because he does not know that the practice exists, or whether it is because he knows that it does exist and has formed a view I cannot say to him. His final question was whether I would look into the possibility of considering adopting a policy to that effect. Well, I am willing to consider it, I mean if somebody makes a case to the Government that is persuasive on the question that it is an improper advantage derived from the use of public funds, then of course I will certainly be willing to very strongly consider the possibility of changing the policy. Let me say that it would be useable by the tax payer, in certain cases yes and in certain cases no, because these air miles are not usually transferable away from the individual. So, for example, if I earn air miles when I go to New York to the United Nations, I suppose it

is possible to say 'well look, next time you go to New York you could fly on air miles'. Yes, that is possible. On the other hand if some official flies on air miles it may not be redeemable until he flies again, those are all the details that would have to be looked into if the Government were to adopt the policy that the hon Member is at this very belated stage recommending to us.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, I do not see why it is that the Chief Minister thinks that it is at a very belated stage, given that I have only been elected for a year and this is, I think, my fourth Question Time. If every time I raise issues that I did not raise in the first meeting I am going to be told that it is belated, then.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only because I assume that before recommending this policy to the Government he has checked to see whether his Leader approves of it, and is belated in the sense that it was not the case when his Leader was in this chair.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think one of the things which the Chief Minister will find if he makes the enquiries which I am urging him to do, is that the Executive Club One World Alliance has changed and enables one now to hold a corporate account so that a corporation that is paying for tickets can accumulate those miles. Therefore, the Gibraltar Government as a corporation, that Gibraltar plc that we often talk about, could accumulate those miles in the corporate fashion and then would make the miles interchangeable within the organisation, but even then, I would accept for example if an individual were to have been a Senior Civil Servant who has accumulated a lot of these miles, or a Minister who then retires and has a lot of these miles, the Government may not be able to take advantage of them and then he may be entitled to fly on them after his retirement or losing his seat in the House not as a Minister. Should we not really be agreeing to look into this in such a way that when the tax payer has paid for the flight, in simple terms a tax payer may pay for four or five flights and then be entitled to a free flight, say a Minister who goes to London four times would then be entitled to the fifth flight free of charge, does it not make sense, whatever the Principal Auditor may say, as a matter of policy for all of us in this House that in future we should be looking at ensuring that the tax payer gets maximum value for money in that respect and that the miles are not used for any other purpose. I think that there may, to a very great extent, be a large measure of consensus across the floor of this House. I know that a previous Government Minister also of the Government side and not the Opposition side, has been known to move around the desks of airports to ensure that his air miles are on the clock and even fly with a particular air line even if it means going as far as Siberia or Alaska in order to ensure that miles are not lost. Let us concentrate on the fundamental issue which is how can we make use of these miles for the future for the good of the people of Gibraltar. I think we have an obligation to the tax payer to ensure that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I do not detect a question there I will not rise.



**NO. 511 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SPECIAL REPORT – THE TIMES**

What was the cost to Government, either in direct subsidy or advertising, of the special report on Gibraltar published in The Times on Wednesday 15 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There is no cost to the Government of the report published in The Times Supplement Report on Gibraltar. The Times does not sell its editorial content or its editorial freedom in exchange for a sum of money from anybody, not openly so. [INTERRUPTION] Well one could be very surprised and I will convey to the Editor of The Times the hon Member's rather cynical view on that. Let me tell him that in fact it does not work like that, there may be publications of a less radical nature that allow their editorial content to be purchased so to speak in exchange for subsidies or the placing of advertisements, but I can assure the hon Member from my personal experience in relation to now several Gibraltar Supplements found in The Times, that the The Times certainly does not lend itself to that. One cannot get The Times to print something with which it does not agree, simply because one places an advertisement in their pages. So on the basis of that caveat, it is nevertheless a commercial operation. I mean, one of the newspaper's lines of business is doing these reports on places and issues and companies and things of that sort, and the viability of it depends very much on the advertisements that they can detract. So against that background the Government, I can tell the hon Member, took out two full page advertisements in the Special Report, one on behalf of the Gibraltar Tourism Board and one on behalf of the Finance Centre. These were at a cost of £10,500 each.

In addition, the Government took the opportunity, because it happened to coincide in time, to place a one quarter page advert in the Special Report advertising the sale of one of the MoD properties, I think it was Loquat House, which was then just put out to tender, and because we thought that it was a property that might have appealed to wealthy people in the United Kingdom, the opportunity was taken to put the advert there instead of putting it in The Times property section which is where it would otherwise have gone.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 511 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government say whether the feature of the Special Report would have gone ahead without the Government advertising?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, whether The Times does a report on a particular territory, and hon Members will have seen these about Jersey and the Isle of Man and about many places around the world, depends on whether they get sufficient advertisements, not sufficient advertisements from the Government of the territory in question but whether they get sufficient advertisements. So for example, if the Government had placed no advertisements but the Sales Office of The Times Advertising Department had got sufficient advertisements from banks, insurance companies and hotels and things of that sort, they would still have gone ahead with it. It does not depend on advertisements from the Government but it does depend on sufficient advertisements from the territory.

**NO. 512 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM's VISITS OVERSEAS**

Can the Government give a breakdown of the cost of all travel by the Chief Minister since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 to date stating:

- a) what the purpose of travel was;
- b) who travelled with the Chief Minister;
- c) who the Chief Minister met on each of the journeys undertaken; and

a breakdown of the travel expenses incurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

On 16<sup>th</sup> March 2005 I travelled to the United Kingdom in connection with MoD contractorisation proposals. I was accompanied by the Chief Secretary and I met with the Secretary of State for Defence, the Rt Hon Mr Geoff Hoon and the Minister for the Armed Forces Adam Ingram. The air fares and travel costs were £1,615, the accommodation expenses were £508 and other expenses were £102.

On 5<sup>th</sup> April 2005 I again travelled to the United Kingdom in connection with MoD contractorisation proposals. I was accompanied on that occasion by my Private Secretary for Legal Affairs. The purpose of that meeting was to meet with the All Party Gibraltar Group in Parliament and the costs of air fares were £1,625. Accommodation has not yet been billed so I cannot give an accurate figure, but it is presumably of the same order as in the previous answer, and the other expenses were £209.

On 7<sup>th</sup> April 2005 I attended Rome accompanied by my wife and my Principal Private Secretary at the funeral service for the late Pope John Paul II in the Vatican City State. I met with nobody on official business. The costs of air fares and travel were £2,945, accommodation expenses were £1,014 and other expenses were £789.

On 14<sup>th</sup> April 2005 I again travelled to London for meetings at the Foreign Office with a number of officials led by the Director for Europe and the Americas, Mr Dominic Chilcott, and that was on a wide range of issues. I was accompanied by the Chief Secretary. The air fares and travel costs were £1,629, accommodation expenses were £557, others were £51 and I have no doubt that I earned air miles on at least three of those four trips.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 512 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question asks for a breakdown of costs of all travel by the Chief Minister since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005. Am I to take it that there was no travel before 16<sup>th</sup> March 2005?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If that is what has been asked and that is what he was told then obviously it is a logical deduction to make.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is this question being answered without regard to other questions which I ask in respect of travel for specific purposes, like Finance Centre travel et cetera, and these are all the travels that do not fit within those criteria?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

These supplementaries do not arise from my answer. The question was 'can the Government give a breakdown of the cost of all travel by the Chief Minister since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 to date, stating (a), (b), (c), (d), (e)?'. The answer that has been given, unless it is erroneous which I have no reason to believe, is the answer to the question asked.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In effect, he has not been out of Gibraltar before 16<sup>th</sup> March, that is what the Chief Minister is telling the House? Not just from the answer prepared for him but because it relates to him directly also from his recollection. He did not travel in January, February or March? There was no travel involved?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Questions in the House is not an examination of my powers of memory. This is the question that he has asked, this is the answer that has been given and until I come to this House saying that the House has been inadvertently given inaccurate information, that is the answer to his question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The House has obviously been given inaccurate information because simply by reading the headlines that were referring to something that we were referring to yesterday, it is clear that the Chief Minister travelled to Algeciras. On one occasion he was frustrated from doing so and subsequently did so and that has not been referred to. This Question did not refer to air travel or anything like that. We know that the Chief Minister has been abroad on other occasions and that is travel, it is

outside of Gibraltar. It may be that I am going to be told that it is impossible to quantify that cost and we are talking about a tank of petrol and that there are no other expenses. Let me also say that it is unusual for the Chief Minister not to be on a plane for two and a half months from 1<sup>st</sup> January to 16<sup>th</sup> March, but let him address that other point that he has certainly travelled to the hinterland on other occasions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suppose then in future when he asks me a question I will have to have a glossary of terms from him to decide what it is. Look, on the basis that travel means physical conveyance from one place to the other, if that is the interpretation that he is going to give, no but the question does not say outside Gibraltar see. The question says 'travel'. Historically in Gibraltar the concept of travel has not included nipping across the border to Algeciras which involves no cost except the cost of the petrol. On the basis of the question as asked and as now interpreted by him as to what the word 'travel' means, I would have to include every time I get into my official car to be driven from home to the office and back, because that is travel. The question does not say 'travel outside Gibraltar'. Presumably the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom travels when he goes from London to Edinburgh, or when he goes from London to Newcastle, that is travel even though it is not abroad. Whenever these questions have been asked in the past it has been assumed that they apply to travel of the sort that I have included in the answer, because I have frequently gone to Algeciras in the Campo area, I have never included it in answers as he well knows to similar questions that he has asked in the past, and he has never taken the issue in the past.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have actually never asked this question before. I have always asked him before where he has travelled for Finance Centre business et cetera, and for that reason I am now saying the real reason of concern to me is that I am sure there is something between 1<sup>st</sup> January and 16<sup>th</sup> March, and that is why I was simply saying to him does he remember, I was not for one moment suggesting that he was trying to hide it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Why should I want to hide from the hon Member, all of my visits outside of Gibraltar are the subject matter of publicity in the press and through Government press releases. Whether I was inclined or not to hide my travelling from the hon Member I certainly would not achieve it by carefully worded answers to questions in the House after the event. They are the subject matter of publicity before they take place, my travels. The fact of the matter is that if the hon Member has asked the question he has been given the answer in accordance with the previously established understanding across the floor of this House, of what constituted travel and what does not constitute travel. Now that we know that travel means any movement, in the future he has got to be careful to say travel abroad, which he does not say here, he says travel, which would include travel within Gibraltar as it means travel within other countries which are bigger. So if he wants to know the occasions on which I have left the territory of Gibraltar on official business and the cost of it then he must word his questions more carefully.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I want to know is whether in fact he has travelled, under the historic definition, before 16<sup>th</sup> March, and I am telling him that perhaps inadvertently it is very likely that he travelled in the months of January, February or March, but as he says that all his travel is the subject of spin and press release, I shall make sure that I check the position for myself.

ORAL

**NO. 513 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – BUILDING MATERIALS**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 514 of 2005.

**NO. 514 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive is as follows:

December 2004	£31,429.12
January 2005	£22,798.29
February 2005	£24,733.73
March 2005	£39,695.81

The amount of import duty collected from persons entering Gibraltar via the Land Frontier since December 2004 is as follows:

December 2004	£23,478.02
January 2005	£11,789.32
February 2005	£12,026.57
March 2005	£12,871.69



**NO. 515 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say why the number of planned hotels in the Eastside Project was reduced from two to one after negotiations started with the preferred bidder?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is the Government's requirement that at least one hotel is built. It is not that the number of planned hotels has dropped from two to one but rather that the second hotel is at the developer's option.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 515 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether that is in fact a new requirement, because in the original statement they issued in 2002 in relation to this tender, the reference was to hotels in the plural. Then in 2003 when the preferred bidder was actually awarded the preferred bidder status, again the Government said the project under negotiation consists of a 500 yacht marina and at least two hotels. So is that therefore a new requirement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No the hon Member has got to distinguish between what the Government were happy to see there, and therefore the tender was for hotels, leisure activity, residential, commercial, and what were the Government's minimum content requirements. So every bidder would have been told that the Government wanted to see at least one hotel et cetera. It has never been a requirement that anybody builds more than one hotel but some people have and the developer now appointed and contracted may indeed build more than one hotel but he is obliged to build at least one of a certain agreed number of rooms with a certain agreed number of beds. Now, he is free to build more than that if he wants to but is not free to build less. The position, wherever he may be reading from, has never been intended to mean that two were obligatory.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

They may not have been obligatory but definitely what they said in 2003 was at least two.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That was what they proposed at that time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Government's position now is at least one. To me there seems to be a change.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not a change. All of those earlier remarks, statements, were publicity material. In fact this chap was the only bidder that indicated that he might build two hotels. When it has come to negotiating the deal that has now been the subject, as he knows, of heads of agreement and all of that, the agreement says that he must build one and the size of it is described but he is free to build more than one. It is not a change and in any event, even if there had been a change nothing has ever been set in stone in this matter. Remember that the original tender was 'Government wants to see developments of this sort on this site, bidders show your interest and tell us what you would like to build there'. So people were always free to suggest whatever they wanted and then the Government, it is not as if the tender was for two hotels, see what I mean, that was not how the tender was advertised in the first place.

**NO. 516 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

On what basis was the area of the Eastside development increased from 60,000 sq metres to 185,000 sq metres?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The increase is due to a combination of the following factors:

- the area of the large marina projection arm sweeping from North to South;
- the area of the three finger jetties, on both of these buildings will now be constructed;
- some additional reclamation at the Catalan Bay end but only to straighten and clean up the existing reclamation.

The figures are approximate at this stage, until the detailed marine engineering design is completed and necessary studies carried out. In other words, there is no expansion of the reclaimed land itself equivalent to the figures in his question, but of course if they build arms on the marina which serve not just to enclose the marina but to have buildings built on them for residential accommodation, that is part of the development footprint even though it does not sit on the presently existing reclamation land that is a rubble tip.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 516 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government saying that the 185,000 square metres includes sea, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have no recollection without any papers of what this figure of 185,000 square metres refers to. I do not know where it is that he is reading it from. I therefore cannot tell him whether it is just the surface area of land or whether it includes the

waters enclosed within the arms, I would need notice of that question, unless it is apparent from wherever he is reading from.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the tender originally came out and the Government issued that statement that I referred to earlier in 2002 it was about the development and the tender and different requirements and conditions, it then mentioned the rubble tip. It said the rubble tip is about 60,000 square metres. The 185,000 square metres was actually mentioned on the website of the developers themselves. It could be that perhaps this includes sea as well as land but the rubble tip itself, according to the original tender, was 60,000 square metres and not 185,000 square metres so that is why we were asking the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, well then I cannot tell him whether the figures quoted by the developers includes the sea. The answer that I have given him is the additions to the land that the Government knows is planned. Outline planning has still not been granted, they are still free to play around with the design. The latest design that the Government have seen has finger jetties and the marina arm enclosing the water, and within that marina there are jetties with buildings on it, so it is part of the development footprint that the Government would certainly regard, even though it is not currently existing, would regard as developable land even though they are creating it. Whether the figure of 185,000 square metres in addition to that includes the water embraced where the boats are actually going to float around, I could not tell him but I will ask the developer and let him know if he is particularly interested.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a specific clause providing for reclamation by the developer, and if so, is there a limit to the reclamation they can undertake at their own cost and for their own benefit?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, there is a limit. The agreement is done on the basis of a certain number of square metres of developable land on the basis of the outline plan which is the one that they presently intend to submit for planning permission which demarcates the site, and they are not at liberty to reclaim outside of that site. Now, if they were to make a proposal to the Government and I do not know whether the Government would consider it but I do not think they have any intention of doing so because there are issues of economic viability by reference to the depth of water and I think the site is already delineated after the end of the negotiating process to the point where it is realistically viable to develop without incurring huge engineering cost by virtue of the depth of the water that has been reached. That is going out. Going north and south really there is no room for expansion because of Eastern Beach and Catalan Bay.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But the Government are not in a position to confirm whether that in fact happens to amount to 185,000 square metres?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Without notice of the question I cannot but of course there are those in the Government who can tell me, if asked. There is a plan attached to the agreement with a sort of red dotted line and people do know how many square metres there are inside that red line, but I cannot tell him from memory.

**NO. 517 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government now confirm whether the relocations costs of commercial activities occupying 11,700 sqm of the proposed Eastside Development will be met by the developers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

They will be met by the developer up to a specified amount.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 517 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How does that feature in the figures that were made public when the announcement was made on the agreement, which produced lots of figures of how much money was going to be spent by the developer? Is that figure identified there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I cannot remember or recall exactly the press release but I am almost certain that it is included in the figures mentioned in the Government's press release, because they have got to pay that amount whether it costs in relocation or not. It is not as if they pay relocation costs up to that, there is an amount of money which they are paying to the Government for relocation costs. If the Government can secure those relocations for a sum less, the Government retain the balance. In a sense it is premium earmarked for relocation or otherwise for the benefit of the Government if it is not required for relocation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say how much?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, given that the Government have got to negotiate with a number of parties it would not be in the tax payer's interests for those parties to know what is the fund that the Government have for that purpose.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well can I ask is it included in the initial amount of money that has already been paid or is there something else that still has to be paid?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot answer that question because the amount of money that has already been paid has been disclosed publicly and therefore people would know that the sum is more or less, depending on what answer I give him, than that sum. I really do not think it would be in anybody's interest except those whom I do not want the information to reach that I answer him the question. It is a significant and substantial sum of money and when the relocation exercise negotiations have been concluded I will be happy to give the hon Member all the information, the amount of money as it originally was and how much of it has been spent in actual relocation and how much of it has been saved and therefore pocketed by the Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask the Government if there is a date by which the relocation has to be carried out by the Government in terms of their commitment to the developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am not willing to answer that question either as that is also commercially valuable to the tenants. If the tenants know that the Government have committed to deliver vacant possession by a given date, it strengthens their hands in the negotiation because they think that by allowing time to pass they strengthen their negotiating position against the Government as that date approaches. Again, I think all of this information is commercially sensitive and I am not willing to reveal it publicly.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The question which is in relation to the relocations gives me the opportunity to raise the issue of the relocating of maritime and waste collection again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh, we got to the bottom of the mystery.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I can just explain to the Chief Minister what it was then there will not be anything to right because perhaps I can go back and check. I understand they had a meeting with the Minister for Trade and Industry, who unfortunately is not here this afternoon, in February and the business was moved there eight years ago to the area of the East Side reclamation they actually do not have any water or electricity, they have been requesting to be moved from there to somewhere else, it has or deals in things like tippers, fork lifters, lorries et cetera, and they were moved eight years ago and they simply wanted to know when they were going to be relocated. Unfortunately the Minister is not here but that was the original question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have to say to the hon Member that that, which actually does not add anything to the information he was able to convey yesterday, still does not, at least me personally, does not enable me to identify the business. Is the hon Member going to write to me?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There is one new piece of information which is that they met the Minister in February.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Right, well I will certainly tell him that and ask him to examine his diary to see who he met in February in relation to this matter. Can the hon Member say whether the individuals concerned have a surname beginning with the letter 'r' followed by the letter 'a'. Yes, they are on the list. They are on the lists under that name and I am aware that they have met the Minister and I understand that there is no difficulty.



**NO. 518 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HOUSING – LOQUAT HOUSE**

Can Government say whether Loquat House has any heritage constraint which requires the existing structure to be retained and refurbished as opposed to being demolished?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There are no proposals or need to demolish Loquat House. The question is therefore hypothetical. However, Government consider Loquat House to have very significant heritage value and would hope that DPC takes the same view if any application to demolish, or even to alter it significantly, were ever to be received by it.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 518 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact when tenders for the purchase were invited no condition was attached reflecting that view of the Government, was it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, on that and on no other property there is no need to do so because whether it has heritage value or not the Government cannot impose restrictions simply by alerting to those heritage values in a tender notice, and whether it has heritage value or not, any alteration to a property requires planning permission and the place where the heritage value of buildings in Gibraltar is safeguarded is in the Development and Planning Commission as part of the planning process. There is no other, we do not have a system of listed buildings. Well, we do but as he knows it is limited to very few, Moorish Castle and things of that sort. One of the pieces of legislation that is somewhere in the pipeline at a very early stage, is a more sophisticated system of listed buildings in Gibraltar and at some degree of listing, at some tier of listing, this is the sort of building that would find itself listed, this and many hundreds of other buildings in Gibraltar. But at the moment the Development and Planning Commission and the planning legislation is the only statutory mechanism available for the protection of heritage because we do not have a more sophisticated listing legislation, which legislation would contain all the things that the Government would want to be able to prevent people from doing to listed buildings regardless of the

planning process. My understanding of the way it works in the UK is that depending on the grade of listing, it is not that one cannot do anything to the building, it is that there are various I suppose at one level it is absolutely no touch and then as the grading goes down there is more and more that one can do to it with particular types of permission, particular types of styling and things of that sort. That is how it would work.

**NO. 519 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HOUSING – LOQUAT HOUSE**

Were any tenders received for 25/6 South Barrack Road and Loquat House which were judged not to be valid, and if so how many were there and for what reason were they so judged?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In respect of 25/6 South Barrack Road, all tenders were accepted as valid.

In respect of Loquat House two tenders were deemed not valid as they involved construction of additional houses on the site. In fact this is a problem that we have had in quite a few of those tenders although the question only relates to those two, where the Government offer for sale the plot with the house built on it, Lind House or whatever, and people send in tenders for the demolition. In the case of Lind House I recall that for the demolition of Lind House and the building of a block of flats. This is not what was offered for sale. Those tenders are disregarded and very often they are much higher in value than the tender that, the house was given to the first compliant tender and in the case of Loquat there was a tender for a higher sum than the winning tender, but it involved the construction, permission to construct three additional houses on the site. Of course the Government sell as vendor not as planning authority. The Government cannot sell the right to build three houses, even if they were willing to see the houses built, which they are not and it was not advertised in the sale.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 519 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

We were told yesterday that Lind House was actually one of the ones that was being demolished.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No that is a different matter. Lind House bought the property then had it surveyed, convinced the DPC that the house could not be saved for any reasonable sum of money and they were given permission to demolish and to reconstruct one house on the same footprint. There is a difference between getting planning permission to

demolish the one house on the site and rebuilding it, which to boot he was required to do in the same style as the house that was being demolished, there is a difference between that and taking advantage of the demolition to use it as a development site for a much larger project. It is two completely different things.

**NO. 520 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**BOTH WORLDS**

Can Government say what action they have taken in respect of the representations they have received from the Residents Committee of Both Worlds Retirement Homes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Both Worlds Retirement Homes is a privately owned property and Government have no role or say in any disputes between its owners and residents, many of whom are themselves long-leasehold owners.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 520 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the answer then that they have taken no action and that they intend to take no action?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well yes, we are aware because I have received a long letter from one of these residents that there is a dispute between I am not sure the name of the company, well I think I do recall the name of the company but I do not think it is appropriate to mention it, between basically the developers/owners of Both Worlds and some people who have bought "long leases" of properties there, who are of the view that the property is not being run in a way that they approve of, or in a way that they were led to believe by the glossy brochures would be the case. This is a private dispute. His hon Colleague has rejoined the law firm that he has, I seem to recall that they represent the other party, I am sure he can tell what the dispute is. The Government have taken the view that the disputes, the issues that were raised in that letter, obviously if there were issues that related to the public highway or to rock falls or things like that there are public issues of that sort in that area, that would be a Government business, or the state of the beach down below, those are issues for the Government but disputes between the under lessor and the under lessee is no more the Government's business than in any private property transaction. I hope the hon Member appreciates despite the name of this organisation, this is not a residential home where there would be issues of whether the Government should regulate the

provision of residential home services, these are retired people who buy a property there. Therefore there is no issue of service provision to the elderly, this is not a case of 'are the Government not concerned about the behaviour in a senior citizens home' or something like that. It is not a case of that sort. These are purely property commercial property transactions. At least the letter that I received raised no other type of issue other than that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Have the people that wrote to the Chief Minister been told that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I believe so.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not the case in fact that when this property became available the Government had an interest in it because they owed a lot of money to the Government in rates and stuff, and that in fact it was marketed as a conversion into retirement homes with very much Government involvement in a supportive role?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, certainly the second half of that is not true. It is certainly true that they needed Government consent to change the use from an apart hotel to things that they could sell, and the Government agreed to give permission for properties to be sold and negotiated a higher premium from the developer, as they would with any developer that asks for a change of user of Crown properties.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was that not in relation to the fact that it was going to be developed as a kind of new activity which was retirement homes, and at the time this was announced as one of the new economic activities the Government were promoting?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so. Look, what is a retirement home? A retirement home is a home that somebody buys to retire in. It is not a different type of home, it is normally occupied by elderly people because elderly people normally retire. I suppose it is possible to retire young and therefore the house that one buys to retire into is still I suppose a retirement home even though one might have retired at the age of 45, but this is all that there is. From the Government's point of view it is an ordinary real estate transaction, the Government had no part in the promotion or in the creation of the opportunity or in the conceiving of the idea, it was one of many requests that the Government get from holders of leases of Crown lands, (a) to extend the lease; (b) to obtain change of user so that they can apply it to a different purpose and/or sell it on better terms, and the Government's policy is to agree to that unless there is a

particular reason why it should not be agreed to, but in exchange for a negotiated capital premium to reflect the increased commercial value to the other party of what they are asking the Government to give them.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact when the change of use was approved by the Government and the premium charged it was not on the basis that the houses that were going to be built there were going to be marketed to retirees wanting to make their home in Gibraltar, as opposed to being sold like any other property development anywhere in Gibraltar. They did not have any restrictions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not acknowledge that there is any qualitative distinction between the two scenarios, whether property is to be marketed to retirees or whether it is properties to be marketed to other types of purchasers who are not retirees, neither increases nor reduces the Government's interest in the matter nor the Government's powers in the matter, nor the Government's role in the matter. So I just do not understand or accept the formulation of the questions. If there are issues in relation to Both Worlds which are the Government's business in the sense that it is something that the Government can statutorily address, then of course the Government are concerned about adverse situations that affect all citizens in Gibraltar, but there are many citizens in Gibraltar, whether they are retirees from abroad or long-standing residents of Gibraltar, who had problems with which the Government cannot help because they are just not in the Government domain, they are not in an area of life where the Government have powers or a role. It does not mean that the Government are disinterested in them, it simply means that the Government have no powers of intervention in them. When we got a letter from a gentleman whose name I do not remember, it was a very long and detailed letter, and obviously they had gone to a lot of care to make sure that the Government were aware of the full extent of the situation down there, I remember thinking to myself 'well, if everything that this gentleman says is indeed the case, then this is a pretty undesirable state of affairs', but notwithstanding that there is nothing the Government can do. Therefore, there is no use in the Government pretending that they can do anything. Governments do not have a reach into every corner of people's lives and private, commercial transactions which are not regulated by statute, here or anywhere else, or in the United Kingdom, is one of those areas and the degree of Government sympathy with one party or another in a situation described in a letter, and I receive many such letters, the degree of Government sympathy is not the issue. It is whether it is any of the Government's business at the end of the day, governmentally speaking.

Now, there are cases in which the Government can informally speak to developers and say 'well how about it?' It is none of my business and my understanding is that it is already well beyond that and that the parties have had recourse to solicitors. If anybody thinks that by the Government speaking to the parties the Government are capable of acting as some sort of broker, if all that is required of us is our time to see if the parties cannot be persuaded to deal with each other, certainly I am perfectly happy to devote some time in that sense, but there is no point in anybody thinking that the Government have any solutions that they can deliver because at the end of the day these are a matter of the civil law rights of the two parties in contract and leases, and that is a matter that has to be settled between the parties in Gibraltar, as would be the case anywhere else in the Anglo-Saxon world. I do not think Gibraltar

is any particularly unusual situation, and that this is a retirement home and that the purchasers responded to internationally placed advertisements. Well, look, I do not think it does Gibraltar's international reputation any good that local property developers should behave in that way and I am very glad to say that this situation, if it is indeed as was described in that letter and it is not for me to arbitrate on that, then it is deeply regrettable. From the Government's point of view it is not that we would take more interest in that situation because there is an overseas purchaser dimension than we would take for example, if it were a more local development for more local purchasers. As far as the Government are concerned there is public activity and there is private sector activity and I think that it is not for the Government to decide when they can interfere in people's private sector activities, unless there are laws that permit the Government to do so. So I just do not understand the hon Member's focus on this matter and I can only pass the issues on behalf of these concerned persons.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

For somebody that does not understand the question it is a hell of a long answer. I am not asking for his sympathy or his time or his anything, I am being quite specific and in the whole of that length of the answer I still have not had a straightforward yes or no to my original question which is 'is it not the case that when the Government decided to change the use, the use was not open market development to sell at whatever price you want but a development to sell for a defined segment of the market', which effectively meant that it was sold at a given price. Just like as if was said 'look, tomorrow we are going to make land available for home ownership and we are not going to charge a premium for the land because it is for that purpose'. Then the developer subsequently does something else differently. Now I am asking the Government is this the case or not? Is it the case that when they agreed the change of use, the use that they agreed to change it to was not luxury housing available to anybody but specifically houses to attract a new type of client to Gibraltar at a given price and presumably that was reflected in the level of premium they charged. If that is indeed the case I would have thought they would have some interest then in what is happening in the place. The answer is yes or no? He does not know, okay.



**ORAL**

**NO. 521 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FREIGHT FORWARDING SERVICES**

How many tenders have been submitted for the provision of freight forwarding services to Government departments and agencies, who was the successful tenderer, in what amount, and was this the lowest bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Five tenders have been received for the provision of freight forwarding services to Government departments and agencies.

The Treasury Tender board has not yet met to consider this tender. The closing date for this tender was 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2005.

**NO. 522 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**IMPORTS**

Can Government explain what caused the drop of £49.4 million in the value of imports in 2002 compared to 2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The drop of £49.4 million in the total value of imports in 2002 compared with 2001 is mainly attributable to a decrease in the value of the following imports in 2002 as follows:

		<b>£ million</b>
<b>1.</b>	Vehicles and Accessories	29.9
<b>2.</b>	Tobacco	6.5
<b>3.</b>	Machinery and Mechanical Appliances	2.9
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39.3</b>

ORAL

**NO. 523 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12 – 1A – PAY SETTLEMENTS**

Can Government confirm whether there was a need for additional funding for wage and salary related expenditure beyond the £1,000,000 provided under Head 12, Sub-Head 1a – Pay Settlements in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 524 and 525 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 524 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12 – 1B**

Can Government state whether the balance of £875,000 available at 30 November 2004 under Head 12, Sub-Head 1b has been sufficient to meet departmental supplementary funding requirements in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 523 and 525 of 2005.

**NO. 525 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12 – 1A – PAY SETTLEMENTS**

Can Government confirm that the 3 items of expenditure which required supplementary provision from Sub-Head 1A – Pay Settlements – are the results of increases in rates of pay, and if not, can Government state how much is in respect of pay increases related in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government published a Supplementary Appropriation Bill (2004/2005) 2005 on Thursday 29 April. This provides for additional spending over and above the Supplementary Provision in last year's Estimates. The Bill also provides for the reclassification of exceptional expenditure items, such as the Government contribution to the Tercentenary Trust Fund and Clinical Governance Review, to be funded from the Consolidated Fund-Reserve and not Departmental Votes. This is being done to better distinguish recurrent Departmental expenditure from exceptional one-off spending and will require the reversal of some supplementary funding reallocations made to date.

The balance of the Supplementary Funding provision is not £875,000 as at November 2004, but £339,000 as at January 2005. In February of this year the Financial Secretary laid a statement in the House allocating £536,000 of the balance which is referred to in Question No. 524 of 2005. The further statements laid at this meeting of the House reduces the available Supplementary Funding balance to £32,350.

The Pay Settlement vote is expected to be sufficient, with some £968,200 allocated to date. Should this turn out not to be the case as a consequence of Departmental or Treasury year end adjustments, then it could be topped up from the Supplementary Funding vote. That is not expected to be the case.

With regards to whether the three items of expenditure from the Pay Settlements subhead result from pay awards, there have been seven reallocations as at 31 March 2005. These all concern pay awards with one exception. This is the £300,000 reallocated in Statement No. 1 from Head 12, Subhead 1(b) to Police Overtime. This was a partial payment towards the settlement of a historical Police claim for underpayment of overtime arising since 1994. The full amount required for 2004/2005 is £440,000 and is to be funded directly from the Consolidated Fund Reserve, as part of the Supplementary Appropriation Bill to which I referred earlier. Consequently, the pay settlements allocation made for this item is to be reversed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 523 TO 525 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the figure in subhead 9 – 6(a) that he has quoted, before or after the reversal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is before the reversal.

ORAL

**NO. 526 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 8 – E – 4(b)**

What was the nature of the banking services in respect of which the Government had to provide £46,767 more than the sum approved by the House in the Budget 8 - E, sub-head 4 (b) for the financial year 2003-2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The banking services provision relates to the introduction of bank charges on cash deposits and withdrawals and revised Corporate Banking Tariffs which apply to the running of the Government's main bank account.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 526 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it then this was something that was introduced by the banks after the Estimates were put together. Is that the reason why they were not there originally?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand that this is something called Corporate Banking Tariffs Business Advantage Service, which was introduced in October 2003.

ORAL

**NO. 527 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government identify which companies were charged by Treasury a commission on property sales, was payable by wholly owned Government companies, which sold the 50 per cent or lesser share of co-ownership homes, in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 528 of 2005.



**NO. 528 OF 2005****THE HON J J BOSSANO****PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government explain how it is that in answer to Question 2462/04 they stated that Brympton Co-ownership Company had paid £62,137.86 in respect of 5 per cent commission on sales in February 2004 yet in the table presented in answer to Question 2467/04 they stated that a payment of £19,793.42 was made in December 2003 and no payment in February 2004?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER****Answer to Question No. 527**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information required.

**Answer to Question No. 528**

The first 5 per cent charge in respect of Brympton was for the period April 2002 to January 2004. This payment, amounting to £62,137.86, was made in February 2004.

However, Question No. 2467 of 2004 referred to the commission for the financial year 2003/2004. The table supplied for 2003/2004 therefore shows monies received in respect of Brympton for the period April 2003 – December 2003, and the element of charge for this period which forms part of the £62,137.86 was £19,793.42. A breakdown of the 5 per cent charge is as follows:

	<b>Amount received</b>	<b>5% Charge</b>
<b>April – Dec 2002</b>	£303,803.33	£15,190.16
<b>Jan – Mar 2003</b>	£543,085.50	£27,154.28
<b>April 2003 – March 2004</b>	£395,868.33	£19,793.42
		£62,137.86

**Answer to Question 528**

**Answer to Question 527**

		GRPI	BCOC	WS2COC	GCOC	TOTALS
Apr-04	Monies Received	£ 86,099	£ -	£ 55,743	£ 28,622	£ 170,465
	5% charge paid	£ 4,305	£ -	£ 2,787	£ 1,431	£ 8,523
May-04	Monies Received	£ 181,329	£ 57,600	£ 154,693	£ 101,385	£ 495,007
	5% charge paid	£ 9,066	£ 2,880	£ 7,735	£ 5,069	£ 24,750
Jun-04	Monies Received	£ 187,842	£ 17,280	£ 94,364	£ 226,152	£ 525,637
	5% charge paid	£ 9,392	£ 864	£ 4,718	£ 11,308	£ 26,282
Jul-04	Monies Received	£ 32,148	£ 72,041	£ 93,611	£ 61,528	£ 259,327
	5% charge paid	£ 1,607	£ 3,602	£ 4,681	£ 3,076	£ 12,966
Aug-04	Monies Received	£ 11,296	£ 29,813	£ 13,410	£ 69,396	£ 123,914
	5% charge paid	£ 565	£ 1,491	£ 670	£ 3,470	£ 6,196
Sep-04	Monies Received	£ 9,544	£ 36,444	£ 37,228	£ 101,611	£ 184,827
	5% charge paid	£ 477	£ 1,822	£ 1,861	£ 5,081	£ 9,241
Oct-04	Monies Received	£ 18,737	£ -	£ -	£ 154,562	£ 173,300
	5% charge paid	£ 937	£ -	£ -	£ 7,728	£ 8,665
Nov-04	Monies Received	£ 184,387		£ 281,275	£ 325,012	£ 790,674
	5% charge paid	£ 9,219	£ -	£ 14,064	£ 16,251	£ 39,534
Dec-04	Monies Received	£ 71,810	£ 28,800	£ 181,518	£ 229,023	£ 511,151
	5% charge paid	£ 3,591	£ 1,440	£ 9,076	£ 11,451	£ 25,558
Jan-05	Monies Received	£ 43,629	£ -	£ 91,114	£ 267,732	£ 402,476
	5% charge paid	£ 2,181	£ -	£ 4,556	£ 13,387	£ 20,124
Feb-05	Monies Received	£ 26,441			£ 47,815	£ 74,256
	5% charge paid	£ 1,322	£ -	£ -	£ 2,391	£ 3,713
Mar-05	Monies Received	£ 56,254		£ 22,293		£ 78,548
	5% charge paid	£ 2,813	£ -	£ 1,115	£ -	£ 3,927

	GRPI	BCOC	WS2COC	GCOC	
2004/05 Total Monies Received	£ 909,516	£ 241,977	£ 1,025,250	£ 1,612,838	£ 3,789,582
2004/05 Total 5% charges paid	£ 45,476	£ 12,099	£ 51,263	£ 80,642	£ 189,479

**NO. 529 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government confirm that the interest on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank reached £10.2 million in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Savings Bank accounts for the year ended 31 March 2005 have not yet been finalised. However, on the basis of the tentative figures at hand, the interest received during the year on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank amounts to about £10.3 million.

ORAL

**NO. 530 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

Can Government state whether the maximum holding of £100,000 applies to investments in Government Debentures as well as to investments in Gibraltar Savings Bank Debentures?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 531 to 534 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 531 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

What is the total value of the special issue of Government Debentures offered to Pensioners in April 2005 for reinvestment of the 7% Maturing Debentures and what has been the amount taken up by the closing date of 15<sup>th</sup> April 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 530 and 532 to 534 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 532 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of March 2005, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 530, 531, 533 and 534 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 533 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

What is the final figure for Government Deposits in the on-call investment account with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 530 to 532 and 534 of 2005.

**NO. 534 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

What is the final figure for non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 530**

The maximum holding of £100,000 applies to investments in Government of Gibraltar Pensioners' Debentures as well as to investments in Gibraltar Savings Bank Pensioners' Debentures.

**Answer to Question No. 531**

The total value of Government of Gibraltar Special Issue of Pensioners' Monthly Income Tax Free Debentures 2010 offered to pensioners in April 2005 for reinvestment of the Gibraltar Savings Bank 7% Tax Free Pensioners Bond 2005 is £28,348,700.

As at 21 April 2005, the sum of £26,220,200 had been taken up. There may however be some applications still to be received from debenture-holders. This debenture issue takes effect on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2005. As of today they are still pre-applications because the existing one does not yet mature until Sunday.

**Answer to Question No. 532**

The value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005 is as follows:

Monthly Income Debentures	£32,870,700
Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures	£70,079,700

**Answer to Question No. 533**

As mentioned previously, the accounts of the Gibraltar Savings Bank for the year ended 31 March 2005 have not yet been finalised, however, the tentative figure for



Government deposits held in the On-Call Investment Accounts with the Gibraltar Savings Bank is £53.84 million.

**Answer to Question No. 534**

The tentative figure for non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005 is £159.22 million.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 530 TO 534 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the answer to the first question which was the £100,000 where the Chief Minister said both, is it £100,000 in respect of each or is it an overall £100,000?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Each, in other words, one may have £100,000 in each making £200,000 in total. I hope the hon Member understands and may even agree with the reason for the limit and that is that these are pretty favourable terms.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

There is no residential requirement so actually anybody can invest.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 535 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT LOAN STOCK**

Can Government state whether they have now decided how they propose to re-finance the £50 million Government Bond which matures in May 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The £50 million Government Loan Stock which matures on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2005 will be re-financed through the issue of Government Debentures.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 535 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Government Debenture that is being re-issued in respect of the 7 per cent maturing debenture part of that refinancing exercise?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not initially. Initially the paper will be held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank and by Community Care Trust. Not initially, the word initially is important there.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let us see if I understand this. The Government will be issuing a replacement stock of £50 million face value to replace the maturing stock of £50 million, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and it is being issued to the Savings Bank and to Community Care. Presumably the small amount that is still out in the market is what is being redeemed in cash?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there any amount still in the market held by private investors?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the small bit that the hon Member is already aware of, £3.562 million. Nominal, remember nominal at this stage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Nominal yes of course, and the holders of those are also being offered the replacement stock?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is being redeemed in cash but not from Government existing resources cash, so it is coming from the proceeds of the Government Debenture issues that I have just described to the hon Member. Yes, I suppose one could therefore say yes. I thought the point that he was trying to get at was whether the Government were going to put their hands into their existing reserves to pay up that element. That is the question that I was answering but actually what is happening still requires his first question to be technically answered yes, because it is in cash as far as the holders of the £3.5 million. The fact that it is coming from the issue of a new Government Debenture to somebody else does not alter the fact that it is cash in the hands of the person who receives it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that I think that the existing public debt is the £50 million and money owed to the bank, how is this £28 million being issued? Is it that the bank lending is being reduced so as not to exceed the ceiling?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

ORAL

**NO. 536 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ABSTRACT OF STATISTICS**

Can Government state when they expect the 2003 Abstract of Statistics to be made electronically available on the website?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 537 and 538 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 537 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ABSTRACT OF STATISTICS**

Can Government state whether the correct figure for the value of imports from Spain in 2003 was the £55.788 million given in Table 52 of the 2003 Abstract of Statistics or the figure of £57.184 million given in Table 53 of the same document?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 536 and 538 of 2005.

**NO. 538 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ABSTRACT OF STATISTICS**

Can Government state which was the main country of origin that accounted for the bulk of the increase from £57.699 million to £99.134 million from “Other Countries” shown in Table 53 of the 2003 Abstract of Statistics?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 536**

I am informed, although I have not seen it myself, that the Abstract of Statistics has been available on the website since August 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 537**

The correct figure is that shown in Table 53 of the Abstract of Statistics 2003, that is, £57.184 million. The total value of imports from EU countries should read £160.399 million.

**Answer to Question No. 538**

The increase in the value of imports under “Other countries” of £41.4 million between 2002 and 2003 was due mainly to an increase of £30.7 million in exports, which are included as part of the imports figure, and to an increase of £9.9 million in the value of imports from Gibraltar bonds. In either case, it is not possible to determine from data provided by Customs, the original country of origin of the goods in question, extraordinary as it might sound.

ORAL

**NO. 539 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state the Net Property Income from Abroad and Net Factor Income from Abroad values in Income Method of the 2001/2002 GDP estimates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 540 to 542 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 540 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state the Net Property Income from Abroad and Net Factor Income from Abroad values in the Expenditure Method of the 2001/2002 GDP estimate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 539 and 541 to 542 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 541 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state in respect of the 2002/03 GDP calculation how much of the amount attributed to Gross Trading Profit was obtained by grossing up Corporation Tax received and how much was in respect of an estimated amount in respect of profits not yet assessed to tax?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 539, 540 and 542 of 2005.

**NO. 542 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the imputed rent element in the rent component of the Income Method of calculation for the GDP for 2002/03?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question Nos. 539 and 540**

Net property Income from Abroad and Net Factor Income from Abroad do not form part of the calculation of the GDP estimate. They are adjustments made to the GDP estimate itself to arrive at GNP. As such, they are common to both the Income and to the Expenditure methods of calculating GNP and are therefore identical under each approach.

The values for 2001/2002 are as follows:

Net Property Income from Abroad:	£ 2.31 million
Net Factor Income from Abroad:	£38.22 million

**Answer to Question No. 541**

The figures requested are as follows:

Grossed-Up Corporation Tax:	£76.82 million
Estimated Amount Outstanding:	£ 1.50 million
Total Gross Trading Profits for 2002/2003:	£78.32 million

**Answer to Question No. 542**

The value of imputed rent for 2002/2003 forming part of the Income Method estimate of GDP was £49.27 million.

ORAL

**NO. 543 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government state what was the total amount collected in respect of Stamp Duty on property transactions in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 544 and 545 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 544 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government state what was the total amount collected in respect of Stamp Duty on property transactions in March 2005 and the number of property transactions involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 543 and 545 of 2005.

**NO. 545 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government confirm that the total amount of Stamp Duty collected in 2002/03 and 2003/04 given in answer to Question 2470/04 was all due to property transactions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Reluctant as the Leader of the Opposition is ever to give me credit for anything that I do, I hope that at least on this occasion he will. Put to shame by the answers that I have been sent into this House to give to him in the past when he has asked similar questions, I have done all that I have been able to be a little bit more forthcoming on this occasion by requiring apparently reluctant custodians of information to spit it up, however much may be required by way of effort.

**Answer to Question No. 543**

The total amount collected in respect of Stamp Duty on property transactions in the last financial year, that is 2004/2005, was £1,891,727.

**Answer to Question No. 544**

There were 156 property transactions that took place in March 2005, a buoyant boom in the property market. The amount collected in respect of stamp duty on these transactions was £105,613.

**Answer to Question No. 545**

The figures given in answer to Question No. 2470 of 2004 related to all Stamp Duty transactions. The total amounts in respect of property transactions in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 were £1,084,419 and £1,279,030 respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 543 TO 545 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer that I was given previously in the House in Question No. 2470 of 2004, which gave the total Stamp Duty but said that it was all property transactions and therefore incorrect, what is the balance due between these figures and the ones I was given?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They were the transaction types.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is right. I was told the last time it was all property but now it has been confirmed that it was not all property and that the property figure is a lower one than the one I was given in the previous answer. I am asking, what is the stamp duty that is the difference between this figure and the other figure due to if it is not all property?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have that information but there are other sorts of transactions that generate liability to stamp duty, share transfers, and he ought to bear in mind so that he does not misread the information that I have given, I suppose we ought to be clear what the phrase "property transaction" means. It does not necessarily mean a purchase or sale of a property. Property transactions could cover mortgages, assignments, leases, underleases, other forms of grants, releases, further advances by a bank. In other words, a re-stamp duty of a mortgage or partial releases. In other words, any document which is subject to stamp duty which documents some transaction relating to real estate property. Purchase and sale, as he as a layman would understand it, is only one of those types of transactions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it does not mean in fact that there were 156 properties sold in March?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. For example, one sale on a mortgage would generate two stamp duty transactions. The original underlease or deed of assignment and if the buyer was financed by a mortgage, stamp duty on the buyer's mortgage, in fact it could be three because if the seller had a mortgage, he would release that mortgage and that is as I recall subject to stamp duty too. So a single transaction, a single purchase and sale could generate at least three, depending on whether both parties are mortgaged or not.

ORAL

**NO. 546 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD LAND**

Have Government made a decision whether the relocation costs and direct costs connected with the release of MOD land will be booked to the Improvement and Development Fund or to the Government Property Company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 547 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 547 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD LAND**

What has been the expenditure to date in the relocation costs connected with the release of MOD land in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 546**

The relocation and other costs related to the release of MOD properties will be reflected in the Improvement and Development Fund. We have made this decision because the revenue is being taken in the Improvement and Development Fund, and in fact if he looks at the Estimates, Tabled today, he will see it reflected both in the Revenue and in the Expenditure side.

**Answer to Question No. 547**

The relocation costs connected with the release of MOD land in the last financial year is £345,217.54. That was paid by one of the Government's property companies and the provision made in the Improvement and Development Fund this year includes repaying that amount to the company so that the full picture is presented in the Improvement and Development Fund. Let me say that that expenditure of £345,000 relates mainly to the works that he may have seen taking place in Four Corners camp for the conversion of some MOD flats into higher grade officer accommodation, which is being done by JBS.



ORAL

**NO. 548 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST (NO. 2) PENSION SCHEME**

Have any additional employers joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No additional employers have joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since November 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 549 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 550 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 550 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of Company Tax collected in each month since November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information that the hon Member has requested in these two Questions is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

## Answer to Question 550 of 2005

### Answer to Question No 549

The PAYE tax (net of refunds) collected in the months of December 2004 to March 2005 is detailed hereunder:

	£M
<b>December 2004</b>	6.0
<b>January 2005</b>	5.5
<b>February 2005</b>	6.6
<b>March 2005</b>	5.9

### Answer to Question No 550

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since November 2004 is:

	£M
<b>December 2004</b>	3.1
<b>January 2005</b>	0.9
<b>February 2005</b>	2.3
<b>March 2005</b>	10.7

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 549 AND 550 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the company tax, I know that the March figure and the December figure seem to be very high compared to the same months in 2003, 2002 and 2001 financial years. Does this reflect a higher level of collection of arrears or the fact that in fact higher profits are being assessed in this financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, this is something that I will be referring to at the debate on the Estimates. Mainly it is one-off payments of tax due, the largest one is a long-standing dispute between one particular corporate tax payer, a bank, and the Commissioner of Income Tax going back several years as to the proper tax treatment of certain transactions. That was settled at that time, the payment was made, so it does not relate to anything in that year. It was collected during that year but actually related to several years before. Of course that will not reproduce itself, that is one-off and there were one or two other payments the nature of which I am happy to explain to the hon Member privately, which also will not reproduce themselves and I think those are about £3.5 million in total in addition to the one of the bank. So they should not be regarded as indicating anything at all. It indicates nothing about trends or profitability or tax collection or anything like that.

**ORAL**

**NO. 551 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government explain the increase of 350 in the number of Government employee PAYE deduction cards in the Tax Year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

On the assumption that what the hon Member seeks is to understand why the number of Government 2001/2002 Employees/Deduction Cards was approximately 5,700 as at 6 January 2004 (Question Nos. 547 of 2004 and 2490 of 2004) and approximately 6,050 as at 6 October 2004, in 2002/2003 (Question Nos. 1879 of 2004 and 2491 of 2004) I hand the hon Member a schedule providing the information requested in this question. That is the explanation for the increase in 350 which is the result of net pluses and net minuses in various departments listed there.

**Answer to Question 551 of 2005**

EMPLOYERS REF	PAYING OFFICES	NO. OF DEDUCTION CARDS		
		2001/2002	2002/2003	+/-
G004	Education Department	155	142	-13
G010	Gibraltar Health Authority	682	721	39
G011	Industrial Employees	791	789	-2
G012	Pensioners (Treasury)	1,345	1,373	28
G013	Royal Gibraltar Police	238	242	4
G015	Post Office	59	68	9
G016	Prison Department	6	6	0
G018	Treasury	1,430	1,526	96
G024	Employment & Training Board	317	366	49
G026	Overseas' Pensioners (Treasury)	361	360	-1
G317	Gibraltar Development Corporation	194	194	0
E149	Elderly Care Agency	128	130	2
S416	Social Services Agency	-	167	167
		-----	-----	-----
		5,706	6,084	378
		=====	=====	===

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 551 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The figure that has been provided in fact includes the pensioners, because in fact I was looking at the breakdown given by the Chief Minister in answer to Question Nos. 2490 and 2491 of 2004, where it showed that the employees deduction cards as opposed to the pensioners, had been 4,000 in one year and 4,350 in the subsequent year. So I take it that the information provided today means that in those figures are people in employment and people who retired having worked in those departments?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not got that information but by looking at the size of the figures I would imagine that the pensioners are included in the Treasury figure. So the pensioners are clearly included in the schedule attached to the question, the fourth item "Pensioners (Treasury)" and then further down there is something called "Overseas Pensioners (Treasury)". So it must contain the pensioners but not on a departmental basis because the Gibraltar Health Authority's figures more or less reflect their establishment, so all the pensioners must be in those Heads and not spread around the various departmental headings.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the change in numbers ought not to involve pensioners but people at work, the last column.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, correct. In fact a large chunk of them is actually attributable to the Social Services Agency, 167 of them, which were previously paid by Milbury and therefore were not included in the Government totals before. The balance is spread around the other departments so we can see the very bottom figure of 167 in the schedule under the heading "Social Services Agency" and the rest up to 378 is the net pluses and minuses of the departments on the issues above. So it is not all, there is one pensioner in the fourth-last item "Overseas Pensioners", for some reason there is one that distorts the figure and "Pensioners (Treasury)" is actually 28. So it does not relate exclusively to people in post.



**ORAL**

**NO. 552 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Based on the 2003/04 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted to date what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and the number of employees as follows:

MOD;  
Gibraltar Government;  
Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and  
Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information he requests.

**Answer to Question 552**

Based on the 2003/2004 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 21<sup>st</sup> April 2005 the information sought is as follows:

	£M	Approximate No. of Employees/Deduction Cards
(a) MOD	4.7	2,650
(b) Gibraltar Government	22.3	6,100
(c) Government owned & Joint Venture Companies	2.6	600
(d) Private Sector Employment	34.2	17,500
	-----	-----
	63.8	26,850
	=====	=====

ORAL

**NO. 553 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2005 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/96 to 2003/04 had been assessed for company tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 554 and 555 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 554 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2005 how many companies had been assessed by the Commissioner of Income Tax without having made a return of taxable profit:

- a) above £35,000; and
- b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/99 to 2003/04, what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 553 and 555 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 555 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2005 how many companies had declared taxable profits;

- a) above £35,000; and
- b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/99 to 2003/04, what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information he requests.

**Answer to Question 555 of 2005****Answer to Question 553**

	1995/96 £m	1996/97 £m	1997/98 £m	1998/99 £m	1999/00 £m	2000/01 £m	2001/02 £m	2002/03 £m	2003/04 £m
Assessed	15.8	15.6	19.8	25.8	88.9	27.5	30.4	35.0	32.3
Discharged	5.8	5.1	9.2	11.0	75.0	14.1	15.6	18.3	10.8
	10.0	10.5	10.6	14.8	13.9	13.4	14.8	16.7	21.5
Paid	9.5	10.3	10.3	14.4	13.5	13.2	13.9	15.3	19.5
Outstanding	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.9	1.4	2.0
No of Companies	1445	1418	1466	1456	1540	1570	1510	1444	1330

**Answer to Question 554****COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Year of Assessment	1998/99 £	1999/00 £	2000/01 £	2001/02 £	2002/03 £	2003/04 £
<b>Under £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	771	597	321	361	441	541
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	1.5m	1m	0.6m	0.7m	1.1m	1.3m
Total Paid	1.3m	0.7m	0.2m	0.3m	0.3m	0.3m
<b>Over £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	43	33	7	12	24	36
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	2.7m	2.5m	0.1m	0.3m	0.6m	2.2m
Total Paid	2.7m	2.5m	0.1m	0.2m	0.4m	2m

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES****Under £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	3	6	11	8	14	14
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	4k	5k	11k	5k	21k	9k
Total Paid	2k	-	-	-	-	-

Contd..

**Cont Answer to Question 555 of 2005****Over £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	1	4	3	8	10	-
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	2k	12k	15k	0.2m	0.2m	-
Total Paid	2k	10k	6k	-	0.1m	-

**Answer to Question 555****COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Year of Assessment	1998/99 £	1999/00 £	2000/01 £	2001/02 £	2002/03 £	2003/04 £
<b>Under £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	209	286	348	387	353	304
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	0.5m	0.6m	0.8m	0.9m	0.9m	0.7m
Total Paid	0.5m	0.6m	0.8m	0.9m	0.8m	0.6m

**Over £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	69	84	107	119	122	116
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	5.5m	8.6m	10.5m	12.1m	13.6m	17.1m
Total Paid	5.4m	8.5m	10.5m	11.9m	13.4m	16.9m

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES****Under £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	5	7	4	6	1	2
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	2k	4k	1k	4k	3k	2k
Total Paid	2k	4k	1k	3k	1k	-

**Over £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	8	15	22	25	16	6
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	0.9m	0.9m	1.4m	1.4m	1m	0.5m
Total Paid	0.9m	0.9m	1.4m	1.1m	1m	0.5m

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 553 TO 555 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The information that the Chief Minister provided in answer to the question on the amount collected in March in terms of company tax, was this relating to some past disputed amount, does he know if that has been reflected in the breakdown by years that there is here where there are assessments that have been discharged and altered as a result of agreements?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I could not tell the hon Member because I do not know if it was ever the subject matter of an assessment. If it had been the subject matter of an assessment there would have been a pretty large figure appearing in the assessed but not paid column, therefore in the outstanding column. Quite a large figure, it would certainly have attracted the hon Member's attention, but I cannot say whether it was the subject of an assessment or not. In other words, the accounts and the issue of the assessment, this is not the sort of tax payer that would normally need to be assessed in the absence of submitting a return, it is a very reputable tax payer, it was a genuine difference of opinion as to the treatment and I would be very surprised if the Commissioner of Income Tax had been quite so aggressive in the case of a tax payer of this kind as to issue an assessment in respect of a disputed fact. So my guess would be that it is not reflected in any of the previous years but I cannot tell him that for sure.



**NO. 556 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD CONTRACTORISATION**

Can Government state when they expect to have completed their report on the economic impact of the MOD's contractorisation plans, should these be implemented and have they now decided to make the report public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The report is complete and will very shortly be forwarded by me to the Secretary of State for Defence, which is the person I promised to do it for not actually as reported in the press and I think mentioned by him in the press, the Committee, the All Party Parliamentary Committee, as I agreed with him at my recent meeting with him. Government do not intend to publish the assessment at this stage.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 556 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government making the assessment available to anybody else other than Mr Hoon?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, one of the reasons why the Government are not making it publicly available is that the Government have been requested to have it provided to the people who are going to litigate against the MOD on this subject, as evidence in their case, basically the Trade Unions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government prepared to provide a copy to the Opposition on a confidential basis?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not willing to circulate the document to the Opposition but I am willing to provide a copy to him as Leader of the Opposition on a confidential basis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am grateful.

**NO. 557 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Are Government planning to take any action, and if so what action, to ensure that a product to replace the exempt status company is in place before 30<sup>th</sup> June 2006, the date by which, under the new arrangements with the EU, it will no longer be possible to provide new exempt status certificate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The future of our finance centre will not be based on the existence of a particular thing called a product, but on the existence of an attractive environment in which to do business. Foremost amongst the elements of such an environment must be fiscal competitiveness, not just for service providers but indeed for their international customers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 557 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes I agree. Therefore what action, if any, are the Government taking to ensure that we preserve that fiscal competitiveness beyond 30<sup>th</sup> June 2006, in terms of corporate fiscal competitiveness?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am surprised that the hon Member is asking me this question but if he insists on asking me then I will have to decline to answer. He must know, or perhaps he does not, that the Government are working closely with Committees of the Finance Centre and it would be foolhardy to put this information in the public domain.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will not press him on the basis that the Chief Minister's answer seems to suggest that it is a working progress rather than any definitive action yet determined, but I would be grateful if perhaps he could give me a brief of what it is that is happening even if it is not across the floor of this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not that sort of thing. The firm of which the hon Member is now a partner is well represented on the Committee and I suggest he inquires of one of them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not asking though in my capacity as a member of that firm, I have had to endure several quips the only one of which I enjoyed was the congratulations when I made my statement. I am asking him as a Member of this House, as a politician not as a lawyer, whether he would brief me in that capacity. I do not intend to go and pollute those of my partners, who may be dealing with him, with requests for information of things that they may have been asked to keep confidential in their relations with him. I would not intend to do so that is why I am asking him to brief me if necessary confidentially.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I am not willing to brief him at this stage.

ORAL

**NO. 558 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

What stage has been reached in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission following the latter's rejection of the Government's tax reform proposals after the service of the Commission's Defence and the Government Reply?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 559 of 2005.

**NO. 559 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COURT PLEADINGS**

Will the Government agree to provide the Opposition with copies of the formal pleadings in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission, either openly or in confidence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The written part of the proceedings will very shortly close. The Court will, thereafter, take steps for the further organisation of the case. The Government will give consideration to the request to provide the Opposition with copies of the Pleadings.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 558 AND 559 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that and in fact I think it is best if we proceed to the next question before I ask the supplementary which is perhaps relevant to all three of them if the Chief Minister will agree.

**NO. 560 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

When will Government agree to provide the Opposition with the details of the tax reform proposals they submitted to the EU Commission and which the latter rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I have on a previous occasion made a statement in this House setting out, in outline, the main and essential elements of those proposals. Government will not publish further details unless and until they are legally in a position to proceed with their implementation and decide so to proceed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 560 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In answer to Question Nos. 558 and 559 of 2005, he said something which he has said already before in relation to the answer he has given now in respect of Question No. 560 of 2005, which is that he will give consideration to brief the Opposition or to give the Opposition that proposal in confidence. In fact, in answer to Question No. 1985 of 2004 he told me that I had been able to persuade him to give consideration, I know that is a couple of hurdles away from actually giving me something, I have been able to persuade him to give consideration to actually giving me the proposals, the Gibraltar Government proposals black-lined if necessary to exclude reference to the UK proposals in respect of which it was not yet clear whether the UK had agreed that they should be disclosed to us. Given that I was able to persuade him to consider that when he gave me the answer to Supplementaries in Question No. 1985 of 2004, have I been able to persuade him that that consideration should be favourably determined in favour of at least giving them to us in confidence?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the Government need to consider this. This is a slightly different request, I mean, this is not the same as the request to give out the proposals themselves, the threshold is actually lower, as far as the Government are concerned in the case of litigation because after all it is just formal pleadings. There would have to be a very clear understanding of what the word "confidential" means. The hon Members could

put the documents or the information that they glean from it to no use whatsoever. I will consider it and write to the hon Member but he has got to understand that even if the Government were to agree, following their consideration to give them copies of the pleadings, they should understand that it is going to be on conditions which they would have to accept in advance that they make no reference in any circumstances to the contents of those documents, at least I suppose until the case rules, until the Court rules.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Of course I understand that and these documents are sought on that basis. I would understand that the confidence would be in every capacity in which I would have that knowledge, so I would neither be free to refer to any aspect of them in an interview attacking the Chief Minister for his folly, if that were to be a particular issue, or in advising a client as to how the structure of a particular tax product in the next two or three years, I would understand that, of course I would understand that, but it has been some time since we have been requesting this information and we would really be grateful if the Chief Minister would, however tight the bounds are that we are to be subjected to, at least give us sight of them so that we stop studying in the dark. In fact, there are instances in which very tight Parliamentary secrecy is enforced, for example, advance copies of the Hartsman Report. Indeed, the Estimates are given stamped confidential on a particular basis. I would have no difficulty with that at this stage because I would understand that if they are advanced to us confidentially then that document to which the Chief Minister referred to this morning, the abridged Oxford dictionary, has only one definition of confidential and he can trust that we will keep it confidential.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The length of time that it takes the Government to consider and to come to a decision that he would regard as favourable, really does reflect the unusualness of the request. It is not usual for Governments anywhere to give to the Opposition, confidentially or otherwise, pleadings in litigation of the companies involved and which are not publicly available. It is not normal for Governments to share this sort of information and documents with Parliamentary Oppositions. So this is not a normal request that the Government are taking a long time to process. It is an abnormal request which the Government are taking a long time to try and reach a decision to give the documents, even though it is most unusual for these sort of documents to be handed out.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I was not actually referring to that, I accepted the Chief Minister's answer in relation to Question Nos. 558 and 559 of 2005 that he was going to give consideration and I was not pressing him in that respect. I was pressing him in relation to Question No. 560 of 2005, where we are asking for the details of the Tax Reform proposals, where at the last meeting of the House, well in Question No. 1985 of 2004 the Chief Minister said that I had persuaded him to give consideration to releasing them.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At best we are at cross purposes, I have just said in answer to his Question No. 560 that Government will not publish further details, by which I mean give to him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Exactly, that is why we are at cross purposes because the answer I have been provided with is published and in the previous answer the Chief Minister at least appeared to me to insinuate that he might have been persuaded to let us have them in confidence, even though I accepted of course that they were not going to be published which was really the main answer, the first answer to that Question No. 1985 of 2004. That is what I am pressing on. Will we please have, at least in confidence, those proposals?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member should read, however open to misinterpretation the word "publish" is, he should read my answer to his Question No. 560 now as meaning that the consideration has produced an unfavourable decision.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The difficulty that I have with that is that these tax reform proposals have been submitted and a number of bodies have had an opportunity of reviewing them. In fact, what is oft said in the industry, in fact I hesitate to put these words into the Chief Minister's mouth but it may be that even he said them, that the tax reform proposals had actually now been adopted by a number of other jurisdictions like Jersey, Guernsey and the rest of the Channel Islands, they have been seen by the Madrid Government, they have been seen by the Government in London, they have been seen by the Commission. All of those parties have given consideration and perhaps even the Governments of the other 15 or 25 Member States have had an opportunity of considering and assessing them, certainly all the Commissioners of the College of Commissioners have had an opportunity of assessing them but the Opposition do not know what it was that was being proposed for Gibraltar and that had a fairly wide dissemination and publication. It is for that reason that I would insist that the Chief Minister consider granting the Opposition sight of that documentation, and I say granting sight because if he does not want to give me a copy I am quite happy to sit in an office and read through them so at least I have some understanding of them. That would not be, necessarily, unusual.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know all this, he has put all this to me before on various occasions privately and publicly, inside of this House and outside of this House. I know all of that. He can see by a comparison of the public statement that I made in this House outlining what those proposals were, and what Jersey, Guernsey and the Isle of Man have done, that what they have done is that. He does not need to see the details of that thick of draft legislation which is all that is left to show him, which is legislation that was drafted because it had to be drafted because the process of obtaining clearance from the EC Commission requires the submission of legislation, and it has only been seen

by people who are required to be allowed to see it for the purposes of that EU clearance. Therefore, it has not been seen by anybody other than the people for whose benefit it was drafted, which are the people who have a role to play in the internal EU process of considering and approving or disapproving, disapproving as the events turned out, and the State Aid rules that process. They had not had any wider circulation than that and there are people locally who know it, the draftsmen, the people who drafted it, some of whom are partners in his firm, the one that he has just rejoined today.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

None of which are sharing it with me.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, professionally I have no objection to them showing it to the hon Member. If he is a partner in a firm that has acted for the Government in this particular matter, as far as I am concerned this is not a Chinese Wall issue. If the hon Member then uses that information publicly or politically I will have things to say to his firm but I have no difficulty with the hon Member seeing it in that context, because then no one from anywhere else can suggest that I have circulated this locally to the Opposition or to anybody else, despite the knowledge that it was disapproved by the Commission. So if the hon Member likes I will give a wink and a nod to his new partners, it is not that I do not want him to see it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Then what is it? The reason I rise to ask that question is this, because the destiny of those proposals now must be either into the shredder, because we are moving on from that, or after what we all hope will be a successful legal action against their disapproval, that they will once again rise from the ashes as the future corporate tax project for Gibraltar, unless of course we are going to abandon them altogether even if we win in the Commission. So if they are for the shredder then there is no problem, I imagine, in publishing them. If what we are being told is that they are not for the shredder and they are very much alive and post success in the European Court we are going to consider implementing them, then let us be told that. But one of the things that the Chief Minister has said is that he does not want anybody else saying that he has disseminated them more widely. Is it that there is an obligation on the Government not to disseminate them more widely whilst the approval process is ongoing, and by extension of that, the Court action which has now resulted from the disapproval process?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am making my position quite clear, the hon Member has made a request to the Government, the Government have considered it and have said that they are not willing to provide him with the information that he has requested, and I am not willing to be drawn any further as to the reasons. I have gone so far as to suggest to him a means by which he may clap eyes on them, to which I would not object, and I think he should settle for that.

ORAL

**NO. 561 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU DIRECTIVES**

How many EU Directives were pending transposition into Gibraltar law as at 31 December 2004 and how many of these were required to be transposed before that date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 562 of 2005.

**NO. 562 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU DIRECTIVES**

Can Government list the EU Directives which required transposition into Gibraltar law before 31 December 2004 and which were not so transposed before that date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have no reliable, comprehensive list of all directives which require transposition in Gibraltar and may not yet have been transposed. The UK has never provided this to Gibraltar and appears to be unable to do so despite repeated requests from us that it would be very helpful to know. In recent years, since the formation of the Legislation Support Unit, the Government of Gibraltar now keep a list of new directives which they draw up from their own sources and research. Of the directives on this list there are about 80 directives outstanding which required transposition by 31 December 2004. These are listed in the schedule that I hand the hon Member. The reasons for non-transposition yet, vary from item to item.

**Answer to Question 562****Answer to Question 561 and 562**

Directive No	Name of Directive
91/439	Driving licences
98/23	On the extension of Directive 97/81 on the framework agreement on part-time work.
2000/34	Amending Directive 93/104 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time to cover sectors and activities excluded from that Directive.
2001/34	Admission of securities to official stock exchange listing and on information to be published on those securities.
2000/54/EC	On the protection of workers from risks related to exposure to biological agents at work (seventh individual directive within the meaning of Article 16 (1) of Directive 89/391/EEC)
77/486	Education of children of migrant workers
87/54	Legal protection of topographies of semiconductor products.
88/599	Checking system for tachographs
86/613	On the application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women engaged in an activity, including agriculture, in a self-employed capacity, and on the protection of self-employed women during pregnancy and motherhood.
87/102	* Protection of consumers entering into credit agreements (consumer credit)
88/361	Implementation of Article 67 of the Treaty
89/104	Trademarks
91/670	Safety Requirements and attestation of professional competence for cabin crews in civil aviation.
97/26	Driving Licences
90/88	* Consumer credit (APR) see 87/102
2408/92	Third Air Liberalisation.
92/6	Installation and use of speed limitation devices in certain categories of motor vehicles
96/47	Driving Licences
85/3	Weights, dimensions & certain other technical characteristics of certain road vehicles
96/53	Max . dimensions/weights in traffic
96/67	Access to groundhandling market at Community airports
98/59/EC	On the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies
97/52	Public procurement - public service, supply and works contracts
97/36	Broadcasting
97/67	Liberalisation of Postal Services
98/4	Procurement Procedures in water, energy, transport and telecommunication sectors
97/5	Cross Border Credit Transfers
98/76	Admission to the occupation of road haulage operator and road passenger transport operator

**Cont'd Answer to Question 562**  
**Cont'd Answer to Question 561 & 562**

97/74	European Works Council.
97/81	Framework Agreement on part-time work concluded by UNICE, CEEP and ETUC, to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
98/6	Pricing of Goods.
98/7	Consumer Credit
98/84	Legal protection of services on conditional access.
97/7	Distance Contracts
98/33	Amends Directives 77/780, 89/647 and 93/6
99/35	Systems of surveys for the safe operation of regular ro-ro ferry and high-speed passenger craft services.
98/27	Consumer injunctions
2001/78	Amending various Directives on the use of standard forms in the publication of public contract notices.
2001/44	Amending Directive 76/308 on mutual assistance for the recovery of claims resulting from operations forming part of the system of financing the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, and of agricultural levies and customs duties and in respect of value added tax and certain excise duties.
2002/39	Amending 97/67 with regard to the further opening to competition of Community postal services
2001/11	Adapting to technical progress Council Directive 96/96 on the approximation of the laws of Member States relating to roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers functional testing of commercial vehicles' speed limitation device
2002/94	Laying down detailed rules for implementing certain provisions of Council Directive 76/308 on mutual assistance for the recovery of claims relating to certain levies, duties, taxes and other measures.
99/44	Consumer guarantees.
2001/23	Approximation of the laws relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses.
2002/19	On access to, and interconnection of, electronic communications networks and associated facilities (Access Directive).
2002/20	On the authorisation of electronic communications networks and services (Authorisation Directive).
2002/21	On a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services (Framework Directive)
2002/22	On universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services (Universal Service Directive)
2002/77	Competition in the markets for electronic communications networks and services.
2001/107	Amending 85/611 on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS), with a view to regulating management companies and simplified prospectuses.
2001/108	Amending 85/611 on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS), with regard to investments of UCITS.

**Cont'd Answer to Question 562**  
**Cont'd Answer to Question 561 & 562**

2002/6	Reporting formalities for ships arriving in and/or departing from ports of the Member States of the Community.
2000/56	Commission Directive amending Council Directive 91/439/EEC on driving licences.
2002/58	Concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications)
2003/93	Amending Council Directive 77/799/EEC concerning mutual assistance by the competent authorities of the Member States in the field of direct and indirect taxation.
2003/26	Adapting to technical progress Council Directive 2000/30 as regards speed limiters and exhaust emissions of commercial vehicles.
2003/27	Adapting to technical progress Council Directive 96/96 as regards the testing of exhaust emissions from motor vehicles.
2003/49 2004/66	On a common system of taxation applicable to interest and royalty payments made between associated companies of different Member States.
2002/7	Dimensions of Road Vehicles.
2004/66/EC	Adapting Directives 1999/45/EC, 2002/83/EC, 2003/37/EC and 2003/59/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Directives 77/388/EEC, 91/414/EEC, 96/26/EC, 2003/48/EC and 2003/49/EC, in the fields of free movement of goods, freedom to provide services, agriculture, transport policy and taxation by reason of the accession of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia.
2004/79/EC	Adapting Directive 2002/94/EC in the field of taxation, by reason of the accession of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia
2001/24	Reorganisation and winding up of credit institutions.
2004/37	On the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to carcinogens or mutagens at work (Sixth individual directive within the meaning of Article 16(1) (codified version)
99/37	Registration of documents for vehicles.
2002/83	Concerning life assurance.
2004/69/EC	Amending Directive 2000/12/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the definition of 'multilateral development banks'.
2002/49	Relating to the assessment and management of environment noise.
2001/45	Concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the use of work equipment by workers at work.
2002/87	On supplementary supervision of credit institutions, insurance undertakings and investment firms in a financial conglomerate and amending Council Directives 73/239/EEC, 79/267/EEC, 92/49/EEC, 92/96/EEC, 93/6/EEC and 93/22/EEC and Directives 98/78/EC and 2000/12/EC.
2002/96	Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment.
2001/86	Supplementing the Statute for a European company with regard to the involvement of employees.
2002/65	Distance Marketing of Consumer Financial Services. Amending Council Directive 90/619 and Directives 97/7 and 98/27.
2003/6	Insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse)

**Cont'd Answer to Question 562****Cont'd Answer to Question 561 & 562**

2003/124	Implementing Directive 2003/6 as regards the definition and public disclosure of inside information and the definition of market manipulation
2003/125	Implementing Directive 2003/6 as regards the fair presentation of investment recommendations and the disclosure of conflicts of interest
2004/72	Implementing Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards accepted market practices, the definition of inside information in relation to derivatives on commodities, the drawing up of lists of insiders, the notification of managers' transactions and the notification of suspicious transactions
2003/25	Specific stability requirements for ro-ro passenger ships.
2003/24	Amending Council Directive 98/18/EC on safety rules and standards for passenger ships.
2003/8	To improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes.
2003/30	On the promotion of the use of biofuels or other renewable fuels for transport.



## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 561 AND 562 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not ultimately surely in the interests of the United Kingdom to provide Gibraltar with a list of what needs to be done?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not saying that they decline to provide it, I am saying they appear unable to provide it because they themselves do not maintain a list of directives in the whole acquis. When they joined the European Community they did not say 'well here is a list of all the things, these are the ones that apply to the UK and Gibraltar, these are the ones that apply only to the UK and not Gibraltar', and over the years they have not been checking this off, it is all spread over all sorts of Government departments. In other words, they have no record of the directives, that part of the Community acquis, in this case directives, which require transposition and which Gibraltar has not yet transposed. If we had that list we could work systematically through it. In the event what happens is that usually we get three weeks notice of an infraction because that is how the UK has discovered it. The Commission suddenly writes to the UK 'you are in breach because you have not transposed in Gibraltar some 1978 directive or something', and then all of a sudden it is all hands to the punt, when actually what we would like is to say 'look this is the body of directives and we can dedicate resources to go systematically through it and not always be reacting to infractions'. Many of these infractions relate to directives that nobody has ever told us we are due to transpose, and then it appears in the press as if we were very naughty and very non-compliant, and it is not that we are non-compliant it is that we had never been told in a timely manner that we needed to transpose it. So eventually all the very historically old ones, all the sort of pre 1990s directives, will disappear and then the current system will be the list which we have maintained since 1996 through the LSU, and then we should ourselves be doing for ourselves what we have long thought the United Kingdom should be doing for us, and that is providing us with a full list of what are the international obligations that they think we need to be compliant with. So it is not that they have got it and decline, it is that they just do not have the record themselves, they do not have the information.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The list I have been supplied with is the list which should have been transposed before 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004? There are probably more which have a later transposition date.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course, there are more that have a transposition deadline which has not yet been reached and there are a number of reasons why, some of them are just disputed as to whether they apply to Gibraltar or not, some of them the UK have not themselves transposed and the UK hates us transposing directives before they do because it shows them up. So the whole series of different reasons why these directives, I mean he will see an aviation measure there, well that is not transposed, there is a variety of reasons and he should not assume that all the items on that list have not

been transposed because we have not got round to doing it. Some of them there is another explanation for.

**NO. 563 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU SINGLE EUROPEAN SKY**

Are Government in a position to say whether they have now considered the legal advice they received on the feasibility of mounting a legal challenge to the exclusion of Gibraltar from the EU Single European Sky, and have they now decided whether they are going to mount such a legal challenge or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No decision to proceed with legal action has been taken yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 563 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether there is a time limit within which any proceedings have to be started?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the answer to that question depends on the nature of the relief sought in the action but I cannot be absolutely certain of that. The position is simply this, if it does prove possible to arrive at an Airport Agreement, which does unlock the aviation suspensions, then of course there will be no need for litigation.

ORAL

**NO. 564 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU PENSIONERS**

Can Government state how many male non-EU pensioners over the age of 65 and how many non-EU women pensioners over the age of 60 were in possession of annual residence permits as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 565 of 2005.

**NO. 565 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU PENSIONERS**

Can Government state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with monthly residence permits, how many such persons currently have such permits and under which provision of the Immigration Control Ordinance have such permits been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There were a total of 32 male non-EU pensioners over the age of 65 and 46 female pensioners over the age of 60 who were in possession of annual residence permits on 31 March 2005.

There is no policy under which non-EU pensioners are provided with monthly permits of residence. Therefore, there are no such persons who currently hold monthly permits.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 564 AND 565 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Chief Minister saying then that when he answered the question in the previous meeting of the House the information he gave me was incorrect?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think that is consistent, is it not, with the information I gave him last time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister recall that the last time, when he said that there were no permits, he said that if I had put 'monthly' instead of 'annually' in my original question the answer would have been yes instead of no?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not recall. Does the hon Member have the Hansard in front of him? How can I possibly recall what I said to him six months ago?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the Chief Minister seems always to be accusing me of amnesia when I cannot recall something that happened 20 years ago. I do not think six months is too much. Is the Chief Minister in a position to confirm that there was a policy decision taken in respect of non-EU pensioners which would allow them to register as seeking employment and be given monthly permits? That is what he told me the last time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sorry, what does he think I told him last time?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I know he told me last time. that a policy had been introduced under which, it was in answer to Question No. 2472 of 2004, and having been told originally that the answer was no, he said, 'persons of the sort that he has described are issued with monthly residence permits as opposed to annual', which is what the question sought. Therefore I said to him, 'well, is the Chief Minister saying that in Question No. 2472 of 2004 the answer would have been yes if I had put monthly permits instead of annual, is that correct?', and he said 'yes'. I now put the same question with the word 'monthly' instead of 'annual' and he is still says no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would need notice of the question and of the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have given notice of the question. The question that I am asking is the question of which I have given notice, and that is to say, I am asking how many non-EU pensioners have been given monthly permits and when was the policy decision taken? He has just told me none because no policy decision has been taken. The last time the question was drafted in exactly the same way, Question No. 2472 of 2004 reads the same as the question that I have put now, except that it asked the number of annual permits as opposed to monthly permits, and the Chief Minister finished telling me in respect of this exchange where I said to him 'if Question No. 2472 of 2004 had the word 'monthly' instead of 'annually' would the answer have been yes instead of no?'. He said 'yes'. Well can I then ask him when the policy was introduced and he did not tell me when the policy was introduced, that is why I am putting the question again. What he said was there had been an administrative concession whereby if an unemployed Moroccan looking for work is actually too old to work, and everybody understands that this just for the purpose of getting his monthly residence permit, then they go and register every six months. I think there are about 35 of the sort that I have just described, monthly. So, I have been putting

the question again to get the bits of the answer to the questions that were not given the last time, but now he seems to have given me a completely different answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would need to analyse the questions and the answers on both occasions and be advised, because both questions and answers have been drafted by the same people in the same department. So without sight of the debate on the previous occasion I cannot just from what he is telling me even acknowledge that there is a discrepancy, let alone explain the discrepancy or acknowledge that there is a discrepancy. I have just got insufficient sight of, I am not going to look at it now. No. The hon Member thinks that this answer is inconsistent with the answer given last time, I will have Immigration Department officials look at it. Can he just remind me what the number of that question was?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Question No. 2472 of 2004 is identical to the question which I have put today, which is Question No. 565, except that the word 'monthly' has been substituted for the word 'annual', which is what he told me I had to do when I asked the question the last time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I understand all that, I just asked him to give me the number of the Questions so that I can refer to it.

**NO. 566 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INTERNATIONAL DIALLING CODE**

Are Government now in a position to provide the information of the technical problems and economic cost associated with the possible use of the 0044 international dialling code for calls to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A possible interim solution to the numbering issue is currently under discussion with the Spanish Government and it would not be in Gibraltar's interests to provide, at this stage, the information requested by the question. I can however say that Government are now confident that all such problems can be overcome, including the cost issues, and that the use of 0044 for calls from Spain only to Gibraltar is viable. That is currently the Government's preferred interim solution.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 566 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is all very interesting, but has the Chief Minister also forgotten that in that same meeting of the House he promised he would write to me giving me the information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, if I have agreed to write to him and I have not done so, nor has he reminded me until now and that was at least a year ago.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, this is not a year ago, this is December last year, three months ago. The Chief Minister has got lots of people on his pay roll to remind him. If he offers across the House to give me the information and can I remind the Chief Minister, maybe that will trigger his memory, that this arose because he had offered to provide the information to the President of the Chamber of Commerce in a debate on television where I participated with him, and when I asked him why was he more willing to share the information of the technical problems with the Chamber of Commerce, he said it was



a very big document and that he would write to me and let me have a summary of the points. I said okay and it has not happened so that is why I put the question again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member can see I am not supported by officials here, and there is one easy way to avoid this from happening again. In future I will not make any offers to him across the floor of the House, in future when he wants information from me he writes to me and asks me for it, then my staff in the office will have it in their systems and they will make sure that he will not forget. It really is quite simple.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister can do what he likes, but what he cannot do is tell me what I have to do and I am under no obligation to write to him asking for information. I have got a right to ask him for it in the House. He can either say he will give it to me or he refuses to give it to me because he does not want me to know but if he offers not to give it to me in the House but to write, then I do not think that it is my responsibility to be chasing him to get the answer. He has made a commitment, he volunteered the commitment, if he has decided that he will not give that commitment in future in respect of any information because attached as a codicil to the commitment is that I must keep on reminding him to do what he has promised to do, then I am afraid we do not see things the same way. Everything that is said in this House is broadcast and I would have thought that on many occasions, the Chief Minister must admit, he has made sure that somebody has made a note of what he has said and it has happened. It has not happened on this occasion, I am not sure now from the latest answer whether it is that he overlooked it or that he has changed his mind.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member's last intervention is wholly off the point. This is not a question of the information that he is entitled to ask for or not, I know that he is entitled within the Rules of the House to ask what he likes and that I am entitled within the Rules of the House to give it or not. That is not what I am referring to, we now have to stand here stating the obvious to one another. The fact of the matter is that the hon Member complains that at some past meeting of this House I agreed to write to him on something and that through oversight, although he does not attribute it to oversight, I appear to have forgotten to do so. I am saying to him so that in future I do not find myself in this position, given that I have no clerical support here to take notes of the commitments that I give, in future I will not make him offers across the floor of the House to write to him, I will say to him what I have said on two or three occasions already today to the Hon Mr Picardo and the Hon Dr Garcia I think on one occasion, that is to say to them 'if you would like me to provide that information to you, write to me'. Not because writing to me and asking me across the floor of the House is quantitatively any different, but because if he writes to me it then enters the administrative systems of No 6 Convent Place and there is much less prospect that I can forget to do it. If on the other hand I just say it here and I take a note on a little piece of paper and I mislay the piece of paper, there is every prospect that I might forget to do it. So if he would like that information, and he says that I have already committed myself to write to him, I will check the Hansard of that meeting, if he is right in respect of that commitment I will honour it, in respect of future commitments I will make no further commitments to provide him with information across the floor of

the House. When the requirement for it arises across the floor of this House, I will ask him please to write to me so that there is a record of the request which can then be followed up at an administrative level.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was not asking him to write to me and the Chief Minister on this particular issue and in this particular occasion was not suggesting that it was information that could not be provided here, because he said 'well I will write to the hon Member setting out the arguments and the relevant aspects of the issue'. There is nothing confidential about the issues themselves, that is what he said, so he could have given me the answer today, and all that I expected to happen today was that since I am repeating the same question of December 2004, page 604, that I would not find any difficulty in being given the answer today. Rather than write giving him a reminder, I repeated the question on the basis that when he had to answer the question he would remember what he said to me three months ago and he would give me the answer today, that is what I expected to happen.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, unlike him I do not have time to remember what I said to him three months ago in answer to one of 563 questions, and I do not plough through Hansard of every previous relevant question to see who I can catch out and who I cannot. I know that that is how he spends his time, I do not. So it might surprise him to learn, or not, I am completely indifferent to which, it will surprise him to learn that I do not necessarily recall the detail, I can remember the issues that we discussed but I cannot necessarily remember the detail of a discussion that I had here with him four months ago, or whether I agreed to write to him or did not agree to it. He says that I agreed to write to him, I am not disputing it, I am simply saying to him that I do not recall it, which does not mean I did not do it. I have already said to him that if it is true that I did, I will honour that commitment without the need for him to write to me, but that in future, so that my lack of recollection of these administrative details, does not happen again, in future I will not say to him 'I will write to you giving you the information', I will say to him 'write to me asking me for the information'. Then he will get the information in a response, that is what I am saying. It is mechanical not substantive.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

All I can say to him is that certainly I do not think that being busy is necessarily something that affects one's memory. At least that is not my experience and as far as ploughing through Hansards, well he may not plough through the Hansards of December but he seems to plough through all the Hansards between 1988 and 1996. I suppose since he spends so much time on the Hansards of those eight years, he has no time left to look at the Hansards post 1996.

**ORAL**

**NO. 567 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**VALUATION LISTS**

Can Government state how many residential units were a) added and b) removed from the Valuation List for Rating Purposes in the financial years 2001/02 and 2002/03?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of 124 were added in 2001/2002 and four were deleted. A total of 45 were added in 2002/2003 and 11 were deleted.

**NO. 568 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NEW HARBOURS INDUSTRIAL PARK**

Do Government have any plans to sell their various interests in the New Harbours industrial park?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are considering a proposal which nevertheless leaves Gibraltar Commercial Property Limited, the present owner which is wholly owned by the Government, as the landlord of the estates' tenants. However, the Government's property company would certainly consider proposals for the outright sale of our interest in the New Harbours Industrial Park if an offer was made which was in the public interest.

No such offer has been made to the Government and none is currently envisaged.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 568 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether the proposal which is being considered and which would leave the property company as landlord, as I understood it, would the Chief Minister be able to give details of that proposal and say what exactly the mechanics of the situation would be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not at this stage.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Might it be possible to say who it was that submitted the proposal to the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not at this stage.

ORAL

**NO. 569 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NEW SCHOOL – FLEET PAVILION**

Can Government state when will works start of the construction of the new school at the Fleet Pavilion site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This information is not yet available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 569 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When the Chief Minister says it is not available, is there not any indication as to when the new In-town project development will start which this school is incorporated to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

When the Chief Minister says that the information is not yet available, he means that the information is not yet available. That is what he means. There has not yet been an agreement signed with the developer.

ORAL

**NO. 570 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state what are the ages of the juveniles charged at the Juvenile Courts giving a breakdown by year from 1994 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 571 to 574 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 571 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state what are the 5 most common sentences in the Juvenile Courts from 1994 to 2005 giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 570 and 572 to 574 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 572 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state what is the percentage of convictions verses acquittals in cases heard in the Juvenile Courts from 1994 to 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 570, 571 and 573 to 574 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 573 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state which are the 5 most common offences in all cases heard in the Juvenile courts from the years 1994 to 2005 to date giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 570 to 572 and 574 of 2005.

**NO. 574 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

How many cases were heard in the Juvenile Courts in the years 1994 to 2005 to date giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A breakdown of the ages of the Juveniles charged at the Juvenile Court is not available. However, I am advised that the ages of juveniles which appear in the Juveniles Court, ranges from 14 to 16 although occasionally younger children also appear.

The five most common sentences imposed in the Juvenile Court are Binding-over Orders, Conditional Discharges, Probation Orders, Attendance Centre Orders and fines. It is not possible to give a breakdown by years at such short notice as such statistics are not kept by the Courts.

The percentage of convictions as against acquittals in cases heard in the Juvenile Court is not available as such statistics are not kept by the Court. However, I am advised that the Royal Gibraltar Police try to ensure that they do not prosecute juveniles unless they have a strong case, and indeed very few juvenile cases are actually contested. Some cases which appear before the Court are subsequently withdrawn on the basis that the matter is dealt with by way of a caution or by way of a Voluntary Binding-over. That is a promise to the Court to be of good behaviour for a period and in a sum that the Court sets.

The five most common offences which appear before the Juvenile Court are possession of cannabis, theft and/or burglaries, taking of conveyances and driving under age. Also common assault, fights between juveniles and causing damage. It is not possible to give a breakdown by year at such short notice, such as these statistics are not kept by the Court.

The only statistics kept of the number of cases which appear before the Courts is the number of information or charges that the Court deal with in any one year. Therefore if a person is charged with three counts in respect of one incident and that matter has come before the Court on four different occasions due to adjournments, this will amount to 12 entries in the register.

The number of entries in the Juvenile Court Register from 1994 to 2005 to date is as follows:

1994	-	418
1995	-	412
1996	-	436
1997	-	485
1998	-	211
1999	-	1108
2000	-	682
2001	-	1522
2002	-	1249
2003	-	604
2004	-	853
2005	-	367

I would just urge the hon Member to recall the preamble that I have given him to that list, and that is that that is not the number of cases because every Court appearance in relation to a case and each charge is a separate entry in the Register of the Court.

**ORAL**

**NO. 575 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can Government state how many persons were given community service as a sentence in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 576, 577 and 578 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 576 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can Government state how many juveniles convicted were given community service as a sentence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 575, 577 and 578 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 577 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can Government state what a community service sentence actually entails in practice in terms of the nature of the actual work involved both for adults and for juveniles?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 575, 576 and 578 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 578 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**COMMUNITY SERVICE**

How many convicted persons who were given community service as a sentence completed them in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member the answers to Question Nos. 575, 576 and 578 in written format.



**Answer to Question No. 578**

**Answer to Question No. 575**

04.10.2001	31.12.01	12
01.01.2002	31.12.02	34
01.01.2003	31.12.03	45
01.01.2004	31.12.04	61
01.01.2005	TO-DATE	22

**Answer to Question 576**

21 Juveniles convicted were given community service as a sentence.

**Answer to Question No. 577 of 2005**

There are two basic types of Community Service.

**1. Individual Placement**

This is when one or two offenders, of low to moderate risk, are placed within an organisation and supervised by a nominated person within that organisation. Offenders are also supervised indirectly by the Community Service Officer.

**2. Group Placement**

A group of high to very high risk offenders are supervised directly by the Community Service Officer.

Community Service work undertaken entails basic painting, cleaning and gardening.

**Answer to Question 578**

2001	1
2002	19
2003	24
2004	36
2005	40

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 575 TO 578 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister say whether any of these are re-offenders or do they involve different people? Re-offenders as in the list, are they re-offenders or is it that these figures are, for example, in 2002 – 34, are those 34 different people or are they people who have re-offended? Does the Minister have that information?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, I do know for a fact that Community Service Orders are not restricted to one occasion, they can be re-issued if the person re-offends but I do not know the answer to his questions without notice.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just on looking at the answer to Question No. 578 it states there are 21 juveniles convicted, do the juveniles also do the basic work or the same as adults like painting, cleaning, and are they also supervised by the Community Officer or are they supervised, for example, if a 14 year old who by law has to be in school and is an offender, are they supervised by the Community Officer or are the schools involved in any way?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No the Community Service Order is only given to offenders aged 16 and over and the same as if they are a student or a person who is in employment they are allowed to continue either in schooling or in education and employment and the work that they are required to undertake is done after hours or over the weekend and the supervisor is always a Community Service Officer, or as I have said previously, a person nominated within the organisation where they are placed.

ORAL

**NO. 579 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for each month of the second quarter of 2005, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 580 to 582 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 580 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for each month of the third quarter of 2005, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 579, 581 and 582 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 581 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2005 have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 579, 580 and 582 of 2005.

**NO. 582 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2005 have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 582/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 579 and 580 of 2005**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE SECOND AND THIRD QUARTER OF 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE.**

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
APRIL	184	292	476	70	151	119	136
MAY	192	289	481	75	149	120	137
JUNE	196	289	485	81	148	119	137

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
JULY	189	292	481	75	144	124	138
AUGUST	195	297	492	80	150	127	135
SEPTEMBER	190	297	487	74	151	128	134

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 582/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 581 of 2005**

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE SECOND QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 2 2005	April-05	184	292	476	70	151	119	136
	May-05	192	289	481	75	149	120	137
	June-05	196	289	485	81	148	119	137

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE SECOND QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 2 2005	April-05	8	2	10	3	3	0	4
	May-05	4	0	4	1	2	1	0
	June-05	3	3	6	0	3	1	2

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 7TH OCTOBER 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
07-Oct-05	187	300	487	73	153	125	136

Cont'd...

**Contd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 582/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 582 of 2005**

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE THIRD QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 3 2005	July-05	189	292	481	75	144	124	138
	Aug-05	195	297	492	80	150	127	135
	Sept-05	190	297	487	74	151	128	134

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE THIRD QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 3 2005	July-05	3	5	8	3	5	0	0
	Aug-05	2	1	3	0	1	2	0
	Sept-05	7	3	10	4	3	2	1

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 7TH OCTOBER 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
07-Oct-05	187	300	487	73	153	125	136

ORAL

**NO. 583 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for each month of the second quarter of 2005, giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 584 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 584 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for each month of the third quarter of 2005, giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 584/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 583 and 584 of 2005**

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE SECOND AND THIRD QUARTER OF 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

Months	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Total	Male	Female
Apr-05	25	29	22	12	18	10	0	116	82	34
May-05	25	28	22	12	18	10	0	115	82	33
Jun-05	26	28	22	12	18	10	0	116	83	33

Months	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Total	Male	Female
Jul-05	25	28	23	12	18	10	0	116	83	33
Aug-05	25	28	23	12	18	9	0	115	82	33
Sep-05	25	28	23	12	18	9	0	115	82	33

**ORAL**

**NO. 585 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE –CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the second quarter of 2005 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund, giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK Nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 586 to 590 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 586 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the third quarter of 2005 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund, giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK Nationals, Moroccans and other Nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 585 and 587 to 590 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 587 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the second quarter of 2005, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 585, 586 and 588 to 590 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 588 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the third quarter of 2005, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 585 to 587, 589 and 590 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 589 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the second quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 585 to 588 and 590 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 590 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the third quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.



**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 590/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 585 & 586 of 2005**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from Apr 2005 – Sep 2005.

	<b>Apr-05</b>	<b>May-05</b>	<b>Jun-05</b>	<b>Jul-05</b>	<b>Aug-05</b>	<b>Sep-05</b>
<b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>	6264	6238	6217	6193	6174	6159
<b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b>	4974	4980	4991	5004	5023	5038
<b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>	1625	1633	1637	1641	1644	1644
<b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>	445	449	452	453	458	458
<b>Total</b>	<b>13308</b>	<b>13300</b>	<b>13297</b>	<b>13291</b>	<b>13299</b>	<b>13299</b>

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 590/ 2005****Answer to Question No. 587 and 588 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the second and third quarter of 2005, showing the amounts from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds is as follows:

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<u>30-Apr-05</u>	<u>31-May-05</u>	<u>30-Jun-05</u>	<u>31-Jul-05</u>	<u>31-Aug-05</u>	<u>30-Sep-05</u>
<b>Fund Account -</b>						
<b>Opening Balance</b>	<u>£478,297</u>	<u>£623,928</u>	<u>£519,831</u>	<u>£612,241</u>	<u>£608,444</u>	<u>£476,244</u>
<b>"Local Account"</b>						
Opening Balance	£19,958	£43,896	£37,255	£60,119	£39,030	£33,153
Add						
Transfers from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund	£950,000	£900,000	£1,000,000	£900,000	£900,000	£900,000
Other Receipts	£3,160	£2,426	£5,710	£1,871	£1,924	£502
	<u>£973,118</u>	<u>£946,322</u>	<u>£1,042,965</u>	<u>£961,990</u>	<u>£940,954</u>	<u>£933,655</u>
Less						
Pension Payments	<u>(£929,222)</u>	<u>(£909,067)</u>	<u>(£982,846)</u>	<u>(£922,960)</u>	<u>(£907,801)</u>	<u>(£932,866)</u>
Closing Balance	<u>£43,896</u>	<u>£37,255</u>	<u>£60,119</u>	<u>£39,030</u>	<u>£33,153</u>	<u>£789</u>
<b>"Spanish Account"</b>						
Opening Balance	£458,339	£580,032	£482,576	£552,122	£569,414	£443,091
Add						
Receipts from DFID	£310,000	£130,000	£1,060,000	£180,000	£220,000	£1,040,000
	<u>£768,339</u>	<u>£710,032</u>	<u>£1,542,576</u>	<u>£732,122</u>	<u>£789,414</u>	<u>£1,483,091</u>
Less						
Pension Payments	<u>(£188,307)</u>	<u>(£227,456)</u>	<u>(£990,454)</u>	<u>(£162,708)</u>	<u>(£346,323)</u>	<u>(£313,609)</u>
Closing Balance	<u>£580,032</u>	<u>£482,576</u>	<u>£552,122</u>	<u>£569,414</u>	<u>£443,091</u>	<u>£1,169,482</u>
<b>Fund Account</b>						
<b>Closing Balance</b>	<u>£623,928</u>	<u>£519,831</u>	<u>£612,241</u>	<u>£608,444</u>	<u>£476,244</u>	<u>£1,170,271</u>

Cont'd...

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 590/2005**

**Answer to Questions 589 and 590 of 2005**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in the second and third quarter of 2005, are as follows:

April 2005	£950,000
May 2005	£900,000
June 2005	£1,000,000
July 2005	£900,000
August 2005	£900,000
September 2005	£900,000
	<u>£5,550,000</u>

ORAL

**NO. 591 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 592 of 2005.

**NO. 592 OF 2005****THE HON C A BRUZON****SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 592 /2005****Answer to Question 591 and 592**

The income expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the second and third quarters of 2005 is as follows:

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<b><u>30-Apr-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-May-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Jun-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Jul-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Aug-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Sep-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£9,289,396	£9,117,288	£14,055,257	£13,788,774	£13,826,152	£13,677,509
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	£878,325	£5,928,314	£826,835	£1,040,982	£843,203	£678,162
	£10,167,721	£15,045,602	£14,882,092	£14,829,756	£14,669,355	£14,355,671
Payments	(£1,050,433)	(£990,345)	(£1,093,318)	(£1,003,604)	(£991,846)	(£1,000,895)
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	£9,117,288	£14,055,257	£13,788,774	£13,826,152	£13,677,509	£13,354,776

ORAL

**NO. 593 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 594 of 2005.

**NO. 594 OF 2005****THE HON C A BRUZON****SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 594/2005****Answer to Question No. 593 and 594**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the second and third quarters of 2005 is as follows:

**SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

	<b><u>30-Apr-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-May-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Jun-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Jul-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Aug-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Sep-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£6,075,862	£6,059,192	£1,068,028	£1,064,344	£1,085,761	£1,092,470
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	<u>£86,629</u>	<u>£91,587</u>	<u>£72,153</u>	<u>£83,691</u>	<u>£80,767</u>	<u>£50,139</u>
	£6,162,491	£6,150,779	£1,140,181	£1,148,035	£1,166,528	£1,142,609
Payments	<u>(£103,299)</u>	<u>(£5,082,751)</u>	<u>(£75,837)</u>	<u>(£62,274)</u>	<u>(£74,058)</u>	<u>(£84,345)</u>
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£6,059,192</u>	<u>£1,068,028</u>	<u>£1,064,344</u>	<u>£1,085,761</u>	<u>£1,092,470</u>	<u>£1,058,264</u>

**ORAL**

**NO. 595 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILD WELFARE REPORTS**

Can Government state how many child welfare reports have been prepared in the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5 by Social Services for hearings involving access to children in both the Magistrates' and Supreme Courts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 596 and 597 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 596 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state how many individuals were employed by the Social Services Agency to prepare child welfare reports in the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 595 and 597 of 2005.

**NO. 597 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILD WELFARE REPORTS**

Could the Government give details of the extent of the delays experienced in the last 3 financial years in respect of child welfare reports in matrimonial matters before both the Magistrates' and Supreme Court and in particular can the Government tell the House what is the longest period that the courts have had to wait for the preparation of a welfare report from the date that the preparation of such a report has been ordered by a court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question 595**

In 2003-2004 the total of court welfare reports completed was 28.  
In 2004-2005 the total of court welfare reports completed was 25.

**Answer to Question 596**

In the financial years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 one social worker has been involved in preparing court welfare reports. Government are in the process of recruiting two more social workers to form a Court Social Work Team in accordance with our manifesto commitment.

**Answer to Question 597**

During the financial year 2002-2003 there were very minimal delays in the production of child welfare reports for the courts, that is approximately six weeks.

During the financial year 2003-2004 there was a noted increase in child protection matters, as well as a marked increase in requests for reports which can be directly attributable to the very significant increase in divorce rates in the last three years. The number of social workers involved in writing these reports was reduced and there began to be a delay of reports of three to six months.

During the financial year 2004-2005 the delay reached a maximum of 12 months. However, when issues of child protection were involved, those reports take precedence over the others regardless of the dates they were requested.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 595 TO 597 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister not agree with me that a delay of six months or twelve months is an inordinate delay and that we should never have allowed it to get to this level of delay?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I think I have already explained the reason why they have reached a maximum of twelve months and I have also given an explanation of what we intend to do to remedy the situation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, but can the Minister tell us why it has taken so long to remedy the situation? If it is already at six months and that is too long and it gets to twelve months should something not have been done already?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

A delay of six months is not even considered a considerable delay by the family practitioners and the people involved, the judiciary in fact. Bearing in mind that a report takes six to eight weeks to complete because of the assessments that have to be done, the interviews, the visits to schools, to the home, six months is a delay but not to the extent that the hon Member is implying.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well I do not know what practitioners or what members of the judiciary the Minister has spoken to about this but the feedback that I am getting is that this is considered a very considerable delay. Will the Minister tell us whether she has spoken to any parents who have had to wait for up to six or twelve months to have access to their children because there is not a report and whether they have told her that it is not a considerable delay?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I think I have already answered my question and I have said that the situation is going to be remedied very shortly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, the Minister has not answered the question, the question is whether she has spoken to any parents who have told her that six or twelve months is not an inordinate delay.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I have already given my view.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Mr Speaker, I would ask you to ask the Minister to answer whether she has spoken to any parents.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

In view of the fact that I speak to people when they request to see me in my office what I can say is that nobody has requested to see me on this matter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will take that as a no.

**NO. 598 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state how many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of September 2005, giving a breakdown of sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 598**

69 Elderly citizens are awaiting a place in Mount Alvernia as at 30 September 2005.

14 are occupying a bed in St Bernard's Hospital (see table below).

**Age Group**

	<b>60-65</b>	<b>66-70</b>	<b>71-75</b>	<b>76-80</b>	<b>81-85</b>	<b>86-90</b>
<b>Males</b>					2	
<b>Females</b>				4	3	5

**NO. 599 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state the number of non-Gibraltarian nurses in service with the Social Services Agency at Mount Alvernia on the 30 September 2004 and 30 September 2005, providing a breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

The Social Services Agency does not employ nurses.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 599 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I apologise for my mistake but could I still have an answer as regards to the nurses employed in Mount Alvernia?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Certainly, the number of non-Gibraltarian nurses in service with the Elderly Care Agency on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 was 39, 18 UK nationals, 21 Spanish nationals. On 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005 there were 93, 27 UK nationals, 65 Spanish nationals, one American national.

ORAL

**NO. 600 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in each of the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES**

Answered together with Question No. 601 of 2005.

**NO. 601 OF 2005****THE HON J J BOSSANO****EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in each of the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 601/2005****Answer to Question Nos. 600 and 601**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in each of the months of April to September 2005 is as follows:

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

	<b><u>30-Apr-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-May-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Jun-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Jul-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Aug-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Sep-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£4,967,003	£4,951,258	£4,953,319	£4,946,692	£4,607,251	£4,606,318
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	£48,257	£70,404	£58,517	£29,842	£53,816	£8,203
	£5,015,260	£5,021,662	£5,011,836	£4,976,534	£4,661,067	£4,614,521
<b><u>Less</u></b>						
Payments	(£64,002)	(£68,343)	(£65,144)	(£369,283)	(£54,749)	(£62,426)
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	£4,951,258	£4,953,319	£4,946,692	£4,607,251	£4,606,318	£4,552,095



ORAL

**NO. 602 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO**

Can Government state the number of units and the value of electricity purchased from OESCO during the period April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 603 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 603 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOD – PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units and the value of electricity purchased from the MOD during the period April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 604/ 2005****Record of Power Cuts – 01 April 2005 to 30 September 2005**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Districts Affected</b>	<b>Cause</b>
1	Thu 19 May '05 09.05hrs	9 mins to 23 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	Generator set No.2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault.
2	Thu 19 May '05 09.51hrs	6 mins to 10 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	Generator set No.2 at WPS Lub oil trip elect fault.
3	Mon 23 May '05 19.03hrs	6 mins to 9 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	OESCO No.4 generator tripped on load, due to engine governor oil leak.
4	Mon 11 July '05	7 mins to 9 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,12,14,15,18	Generator set No.1 at WPS Lub faulty emergency stop valve.
5	Sat 17 August '05 12.05hrs	9 mins to 12 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	OESCO No.7 generator under test at 4MW, tripped on load, due to low lub oil pressure switch.
6	Sun 4 September '05 14.35hrs	9 mins to 13 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	Generator set No.1 at WPS Lub oil trip elect fault.
7	Tue 6 September '05 00.26hrs	8 mins to 9 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	OESCO No.3 generator shutdown instead of No.1 – operator error.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 602 AND 603 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a particular reason why the purchase from OESCO seems to have gone up by 50 per cent in August and September compared to the sort of average of the preceding three months?

**HON F VINET:**

I am not aware of any particular reason, these figures fluctuate from time to time from month to month but I need notice in order to find out what the particular reasons for that increase have been.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I note what the Minister has said but in fact the figures do not show the fluctuation from month to month. In fact if he looks at April, May, June and July it is nowhere like the 2 million units that there are in August and September. Would it be the case that the less electricity was produced for some reason by the Government's own generating plant in those two months?

**HON F VINET:**

I am not aware but I will certainly research the issue and get back to the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does he know whether there was any plant breakdown or anything in August and September that might account for it? Is he aware for example of any breakdown in the generating station plant in those months?

**HON F VINET:**

No, I am not aware of any such breakdown I am aware of course that during the summer months there is a greater need for electricity, there is a greater demand because of the use of air-conditioning systems and so on. I recognise that does not directly reply to the question being asked and I will certainly attempt to have information for the hon Member as soon as possible.

-----

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the light of the possible explanation that the Minister gave me about the increase in August in the purchase from OESCO where in fact the amount paid to OESCO for example in August was £855,000 and in June it was £427,000, so there was over an 100 per cent increase between June and August, can I point out that the amount

billed to customers in June was £1.17 million and in August it was £1.25 million which in fact indicates that the electricity supplied to the customers in August was little more than was supplied in June, and nevertheless the amount that was purchased from OESCO was twice as much, so in fact it cannot have been increased consumption. If he looks at the amounts billed to all consumers under all tariffs he will see that the figures for August and September £1.25 million and £1.35 million are not very different from the figures for May, June and July which indicates that the actual output of electricity invoiced to customers was not in fact on the increase in the months of August and September, yet the amount purchased by the Government for re-sale doubled so that inevitably must mean that the Government had a dramatic drop in their own production, would he not agree? There is no other way of squaring the figures.

**HON F VINET:**

At this stage I have nothing further to comment other than as I have said I would research the issue and get back to the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I appreciate he may not have the details but would he not agree with me that if the Government bought twice as much electricity from OESCO and sold the same amount of electricity as they were selling in previous months then what did they do with the electricity if they had that much? It is not a marginal amount we are talking about 100 per cent increase in the amount paid to OESCO in those two months which would indicate twice as much being bought. If we look at the amount supplied to the public there is no increase so would he not accept that on the basis of the information that he has provided in the House today the inevitable conclusion must be that for some reason, which I accept he does not know at the moment, the Government must have produced less electricity from their own generating capacity in those two months.

**HON F VINET:**

I hear the assessment being made and I certainly think there is logic in that assessment but I would not like to comment any further until I have the full facts before me.

ORAL

**NO. 604 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in the semester ended 30 September 2005, the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 604/ 2005**

**Record of Power Cuts – 01 April 2005 to 30 September 2005**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Districts Affected</b>	<b>Cause</b>
1	Thu 19 May '05 09.05hrs	9 mins to 23 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	Generator set No.2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault.
2	Thu 19 May '05 09.51hrs	6 mins to 10 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	Generator set No.2 at WPS Lub oil trip elect fault.
3	Mon 23 May '05 19.03hrs	6 mins to 9 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	OESCO No.4 generator tripped on load, due to engine governor oil leak.
4	Mon 11 July '05	7 mins to 9 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,12,14,15,18	Generator set No.1 at WPS Lub faulty emergency stop valve.
5	Sat 17 August '05 12.05hrs	9 mins to 12 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	OESCO No.7 generator under test at 4MW, tripped on load, due to low lub oil pressure switch.
6	Sun 4 September '05 14.35hrs	9 mins to 13 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	Generator set No.1 at WPS Lub oil trip elect fault.
7	Tue 6 September '05 00.26hrs	8 mins to 9 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS. 10,13,14,15,18	OESCO No.3 generator shutdown instead of No.1 – operator error.

ORAL

**NO. 605 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC UNITS**

Can Government state the number of customers invoiced in respect of Domestic Units of electricity during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 606 to 611 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 606 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC UNITS**

Can Government state the number of customers invoiced in respect of Domestic Units of electricity during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 605 and 607 to 611 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 607 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC UNITS**

Can Government state the total value invoiced in respect of Domestic Units of electricity during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 605, 606 and 608 to 611 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 608 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – STANDING CHARGES**

Can Government state the values in respect of Electricity Standing Charges invoiced to Domestic Customers during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 605 to 607 and 609 to 611 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 609 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT**

Can Government state the values in respect of Fuel Cost Adjustment (F.C.A.) that were invoiced to Domestic Customers during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 605 to 608, 610 and 611 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 610 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT**

Can Government state the values in respect of Fuel Cost Adjustment (F.C.A.) that were invoiced to Domestic Customers during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 605 to 609 and 611 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 611 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state what was the amount collected and the amount billed in respect of electricity in the periods April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I now hand over.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 611****Answer to Question 606/2005****Number of Consumers billed (invoiced) under T3 Domestic Tariff**

	April	May	June	July	August	September
2004	12,576	12,614	12,617	12,624	12,619	12,611
2005	12,595	12,589	12,584	12,577	12,582	12,576

**Answer to Question 607/2005****Tariff T3 Domestic****Amounts Billed (Invoiced) to Consumers**

	April	May	June	July	August	September	TOTAL
2004	£466,544	£389,547	£369,419	£360,568	£363,470	£360,757	£2,310,332
2005	£523,658	£466,698	£435,811	£426,952	£425,426	£464,964	£2,743,509

**Answer to Question 608/2005****Standing Charges billed to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers**

	April	May	June	July	August	September	TOTAL
2004	£25,208	£25,170	£25,878	£25,534	£25,118	£25,342	£152,250
2005	£49,222	£50,514	£50,248	£50,034	£50,072	£50,046	£300,138

**Answer to Question 609 and 610/2005****FCA billed to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers**

	April	May	June	July	August	September	TOTAL
2004	£133,271	£110,030	£103,721	£101,153	£102,207	£101,229	£651,611
2005	£145,092	£127,273	£117,913	£115,273	£114,791	£126,890	£747,232

**Answer to Question 611/2005****Amounts Billed to all consumers under all tariffs**

	April	May	June	July	August	September	TOTAL
2004	£1,024,234	£894,007	£964,234	£989,739	£1,018,172	£3,349,812	£8,240,197
2005	£1,314,634	£1,236,782	£1,175,059	£1,245,571	£1,255,303	£1,354,884	£7,582,234

**Amounts Collected from all consumers under all tariffs**

	April	May	June	July	August	September	TOTAL
2004	£888,930	£1,001,096	£976,365	£822,568	£836,974	£1,015,301	£5,541,235
2005	£1,095,686	£1,318,490	£1,177,373	£1,257,935	£1,238,161	£1,170,966	£7,258,612

ORAL

**NO. 612 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC PRIMARY UNITS**

Can Government state the volume of units of Domestic Primary Units of water invoiced during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 613 to 618 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 613 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC PRIMARY UNITS**

Can Government state the value of Domestic Primary Units of water invoiced during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 612 and 614 to 618 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 614 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC SECONDARY UNITS**

Can Government state the volume of units of Domestic Secondary Units of water invoiced during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 612, 613 and 615 to 618 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 615 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC SECONDARY UNITS**

Can Government state the value of Domestic Secondary Units of water invoiced during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 612 to 614 and 616 to 618 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 616 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – DOMESTIC SECONDARY UNITS**

Can Government state the number of customers that were invoiced for Domestic Secondary Units of water during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 612 to 615, 617 and 618 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 617 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATER STANDING CHARGES**

Can Government state the values in respect of Water Standing Charges invoiced to Domestic Customers during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 612 to 616 and 618 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 618 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATER – CHARGES**

Can Government state what was the amount collected and the amount billed in respect of water in the periods April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 618**

**Answer to Question 612**

**Potable Water Billed by Units Domestic (Primary)**

	April '04	May '04	June '04	July '04	Aug '04	Sept '04	Total
Potable Water Billed by Units Domestic (Primary)	378900	384280	377750	386020	380090	391670	2298710

**Potable Water '05**

	April '05	May '05	June '05	July '05	Aug '05	Sept '05	Total
Potable Water Billed by Units Domestic (Primary)	388900	378020	373910	380250	390240	384260	2295580

Contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 618**

**Answer to Question 613**

**Potable Water Billed by Value Domestic (Primary)**

**April '04 to Sept '04**

	April '04	May '04	June '04	July '04	Aug '04	Sept '04	Total
Potable Water billed by Value Domestic (Primary) (Inc. S.C.)	£88,016	£85,938	£85,131	£89,970	£88,142	£86,943	£524,140
Less Standing Charges	£17,837	£17,772	£17,618	£17,586	£17,777	£17,559	£106,149
Primary Units Value	£70,179	£68,166	£67,513	£72,384	£70,365	£69,384	£417,991

**April '05 to Sept '05**

	April '05	May '05	June '05	July '05	Aug '05	Sept '05	Total
Potable Water billed by Value Domestic (Primary) (Inc. S.C.)	£114,579	£116,073	£115,075	£116,412	£115,304	£117,535	£694,977
Less Standing Charges	£34,811	£35,031	£35,001	£35,090	£35,019	£35,018	£209,970
Primary Units Value	£79,768	£81,042	£80,074	£81,322	£80,285	£82,517	£485,007

Contd...



**Contd Answer to Question 618****Answer to Question 614****Potable Water billed by Units Domestic (Secondary)****April '04 to September '04**

	April '04	May '04	Jun '04	July '04	Aug '04	Sept '04	Total
Potable Water billed by Units Domestic (Secondary)	253670	203570	217650	240740	255760	240260	1411650

**April '05 to September '05**

	April '05	May '05	Jun '05	July '05	Aug '05	Sept '05	Total
Potable Water billed by Units Domestic (Secondary)	226210	231800	214560	231340	228750	261680	1394340

**Answer to Question 615****Potable Water billed by Value Domestic (Secondary)****April '04 to September '04**

	April '04	May '04	June '04	July '04	Aug '04	Sept '04	Total
Potable Water billed by Value Domestic (Secondary)	£114,152	£91,608	£97,945	£108,331	£115,091	£108,116	£635,243

**April '05 to September '05**

	April '05	May '05	June '05	July '05	Aug '05	Sept '05	Total
Potable Water billed by Value Domestic (Secondary)	£117,629	£120,535	£111,572	£120,298	£118,949	£136,071	£725,055

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 618****Answer to Question 616**

Months	April '04	May '04	June '04	July '04	August '04	Sept '04
No. of Consumers of Secondary Units	5852	5386	5484	5712	5761	5510

Months	April '05	May '05	June '05	July '05	August '05	Sept '05
No. of Consumers of Secondary Units	5559	5588	5361	5573	5521	5949

**Answer to Question 617****Potable Water Standing Charges Domestic****April '04 to September '04**

	April '04	May '04	June '04	July '04	Aug '04	Sept '04	Total
Standing Charges Domestic	£17,837	£17,772	£17,618	£17,586	£17,777	£17,559	£106,148

**April '05 to September '05**

	April '05	May '05	June '05	July '05	Aug '05	Sept '05	Total
Standing Charges Domestic	£34,811	£35,031	£35,001	£35,090	£35,019	£35,018	£209,969

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 618**

**Answer to Question 618**

**Billing and Collections Potable Water 2004/2005**

**2004**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Amount Billed</b>	<b>Total Collections</b>
B/F		
April '04	£340,139.76	£279,851.89
May '04	£316,465.08	£304,436.63
June '04	£345,408.77	£370,071.21
July '04	£345,321.58	£245,304.56
August '04	£366,295.44	£326,482.20
September '04	£382,391.41	£373,838.49
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,095,022.04</b>	<b>£1,899,984.98</b>

**2005**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Amount Billed</b>	<b>Total Collections</b>
B/F		
April '05	£405,630.64	£362,248.03
May '05	£428,961.81	£369,886.26
June '05	£438,315.24	£404,099.85
July '05	£417,878.43	£493,061.74
August '05	£414,171.27	£410,174.59
September '05	£452,875.88	£398,766.51
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,557,833.27</b>	<b>£2,438,236.98</b>

ORAL

**NO. 619 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state what youth programmes are currently being conducted by the Youth Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 620 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 620 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state how many young people are currently enrolled in youth programmes run by the Youth Service giving a breakdown by programme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand over to him.

**Answer to Question 620**

**Answer to Questions 619 and 620**

**GIBRALTAR YOUTH SERVICE LED PROGRAMMES – AS AT OCTOBER 2005**

Youth Service	Part of clean the world programme continues in all four clubs	30 boys and girls
Trip to Isla Magica – Sat 8 <sup>th</sup> Oct		13 to 17 yrs
Cooking – Diet & Hygiene	Plater Youth Club	20 boys and girls
Football five-a-side		12 to 17 yrs
Club Physical and Recreation Programme	Laguna Youth Club	20 boys and girls 12 to 17 yrs
Discos (Organisation)	Youth Centre	35 boys and girls 13 to 17 yrs
Cooking – Diet & Hygiene	Dolphins Youth Club	10 boys and girls
Arts and Crafts, Social Skills		11 to 15 yrs
Young People's Peer Led Conference	Organised by Active Citizenship Group & Students Associations with the Participation of Youth Clubs, Scouts, Guides, Duke of Edinburgh's Award and the support of the Youth Service.	40+boys and girls 16 to 25 yrs
Twinning Project With Ballymena	Developed and staffed by the Gibraltar Youth Service	10 boys & girls 15 to 18 yrs
Luce Foundation Funded Projects	Developed and staffed by the Gibraltar Youth Service	20+boys & girls

Consideration is currently being given to other programmes including leader training, and twinning with other regions following requests received through His Worship the Mayor.

Apart from the above all Youth Clubs organise session programmes on a daily/weekly basis to continue providing regular youth club visitors enjoyable yet educational and worthwhile experiences at their required levels.

ORAL

**NO. 621 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – MONIES STOLEN**

Will the Minister for Culture state whether the investigation conducted by the RGP on the monies stolen from the Youth Services offices has now concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Royal Gibraltar Police have recently confirmed that their investigation into this incident is still open.

**NO. 622 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KINGS BASTION**

Will Government state whether the Leisure Centre at Kings Bastion will be run commercially or whether it will become part of the Sports and Leisure Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

This decision has not yet been taken, both remain possibilities for consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 622 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister envisage that part of it might be the Sports and Leisure Authority and other parts might be commercially run by a management company or whatever?

**HON F VINET:**

That is precisely the decision that has not been reached. All the options are available on the table and they are being presently considered.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Who will be the owners of the Leisure Centre since the Government will have a decision to take whether to run it by the Sports and Leisure Authority or commercially?

**HON F VINET:**

That has been the subject in fact of a supplementary question some months ago, I recall it was the Chief Minister who explained that the property itself belongs to the Government whether it is a private entity that runs it, whether it is the Sports and Leisure Authority that does so regardless of either of those two options they will run it on behalf of the Government and for the Government.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Government tell us when they expect the decision to be made on all of these issues given that we have seen highlighted in the press that building works have commenced?

**HON F VINET:**

No, building works as such have not commenced, the internal structures have now been demolished, the demolition of the generating station building as such commenced last Monday, they are expected to be completed by 2<sup>nd</sup> December I believe and the building work proper is expected to commence very early in the new year. I think it would be premature at this stage to actually consider in more detail what will be the final outcome as regards to the questions. I think there will be ample time to consider those possibilities.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Actually would the Minister not agree with me that instead of being premature it might actually be considered good planning to know who is going to run the place before actually starting the process of demolishing and building it?

**HON F VINET:**

The hon Member is very much entitled to that opinion, it is one that I do not particularly share.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When does the Minister envisage that the leisure centre will be complete?

**HON F VINET:**

As was explained in the press release that was issued a couple of weeks ago, design work is presently on-going we are reaching the final stages of the design work, until we know what the design itself will deliver it is not possible to give a specific time frame for that. Certainly, as has been said before in this House, this is a manifesto commitment with which we fully expect to deliver before the next elections.

**HON S E LINARES:**

If one is still at the design work how then can the Government state that they are going to have different facilities if they are still designing the facilities and still trying to ascertain what they are going to put there?

**HON F VINET:**

It is perfectly possible to be aware and to have ascertained and to be completely certain of what facilities the leisure centre will include, we have mentioned that it will include a bowling complex for example, a multi-screen cinema, restaurants, an ice-skating rink, disco and so on. Those are the things that will be forming the leisure centre, now the actual building itself, the actual design work to the building is at its final stages and that does not affect in any way what will be included in that building.

**NO. 623 OF 2005****THE HON S E LINARES****CULTURE – GRANTS**

Can Government state how much money has been given to cultural groups in the present year giving a breakdown by group and amount given to each?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The sum of £20,879 has been given to date in the current financial year. The breakdown requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 623/2005**

	£
Gibraltar Bird Breeders Association	2500.00
Gibraltar National Dance Organisation	4000.00
Nathan Payas	1500.00
Tarik Modern Theatre Dance Academy	2000.00
Anouih Players	1016.00
Rock on the Rock Club	500.00
Allegro Music Productions	1500.00
Gibraltar Horticultural Society	500.00
Gibraltar Photographic Society	900.00
Revelations Dance Academy	270.00
Danza Academy	500.00
Gibraltar Academy of Dance	500.00
JM Memorial Foundation	565.00
Fine Arts Association	1328.00
MO Productions	1300.00
M Finlayson/J Dalmedo/A Avellano	2000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>20879.00</b>

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 623 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister explain why there has been a decrease this year in the amount handed over?

**HON F VINET:**

No, there is a Cultural Grant Committee which meets on an annual basis to consider the applications received by Government by that committee and it is a matter for that committee to decide how to distribute the funds available. It does not necessarily follow that the funds being asked for are the same as have been applied for in previous years. I ought to perhaps also add that the approved funds were £25,000 so therefore the hon Member will notice there are still some funds available and those will in all certainty be used before the end of the year.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister then state that most of the groups and associations that have applied usually get the amount that they ask for?

**HON F VINET:**

No, we have to bear in mind the fact that we have £25,000 available, some associations may request funds of up to, without mentioning names, in this particular year there was one particular application for £15,000. We have to be realistic we know what funds available are and we will distribute them as fairly as possible but no, it does not necessarily follow that all the groups get all or most of the funding available and others do. It is a question to be determined on the merits of each particular case.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So therefore there has been a slight shift in policy from Government in the sense that last year the money that was allocated in the budget for the groups were given out outright because they were, if I remember correctly off the top of my head, it was approximately £26,000 and therefore it was all given out because the budget was £25,000 odd it just went over a little bit and therefore the money was given outright that means if one had budgeted £25,000 one gives the £25,000 for the groups when this committee meets and gives them out. This year it seems as if one is retaining some money for other events later on during the year, that is all that I am asking.

**HON F VINET:**

There has been no shift in Government policy or in the policy of the Cultural Advance Committee. I also should explain as well that there are presently three further applications which are being considered because we have requested further

information from those parties, so we do fully expect all those funds to have been distributed before the end of the present financial year.

ORAL

**NO. 624 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CULTURE – BATTLE OF TRAFALGAR**

What events are being planned by the Government in or outside Gibraltar for the celebration of the bicentenary of the Battle of Trafalgar and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member, together with details of events that have currently been held and other already held this year, is contained in the schedule that I hand over to him.

### **Answer to Question 624/2005**

#### **1. Events planned by Government for the remainder of the year are as follows:**

16<sup>th</sup> October 2005 – Sailing – Royal Gibraltar Yacht Club – Trafalgar Bicentenary Regatta

17<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> October 2005 – Royal Cruising Club – The Trafalgar Rally – Gibraltar to Cape Trafalgar

28<sup>th</sup> October 2005 – Unveiling of Statue of Admiral Lord Nelson

28<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> October 2005 – Calpe Conference – ‘Sentinel of the Mediterranean, Gibraltar the Navy and the Strait’

3<sup>rd</sup> November 2005 – Talk – ‘Gibraltar, the City and the Sea’

24<sup>th</sup> November 2005 – Talk – ‘Gibraltar’s Hidden Heritage: Underwater Archaeology Reveals’

5<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> December 2005 – Gibraltar Model Soldier Society – ‘The Battle of Trafalgar’

#### **2. Event currently taking place from 6<sup>th</sup> September up to 5<sup>th</sup> November 2005 at Casemates Exhibition Galleries – Maritime Exhibition.**

#### **3. Events that have already been held:**

<b>June 2005</b>	11 <sup>th</sup>	Open Air Concert – Rooke Volunteer Band
	30 <sup>th</sup>	Swimming Gala – Oxford University and GASA
	30 <sup>th</sup>	Talk – ‘The History of HMS Calpe – Personal Reflections’
<b>July 2005</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Swimming – Round Rock Relay – Oxford Univ. and GASA
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Open Air Concert – Rooke Volunteer Band
	3 <sup>rd</sup>	Rowing – Nelson Regattas
		Gibraltar Amateur Rowing Association
	14 <sup>th</sup>	Talk – ‘History and Collections of the Gibraltar Museum’
	16 <sup>th</sup>	Big Game Fishing
<b>August 2005</b>	24 <sup>th</sup>	Rowing – Trafalgar Bicentenary Regattas
	6 <sup>th</sup>	Open Air Concert – Rooke Volunteer Band
	13 <sup>th</sup>	Sailing – Admiral Lord Nelson Regatta
	24 <sup>th</sup>	Boat Fishing Competition – Gib Federation of Sea Anglers
<b>September 2005</b>	4 <sup>th</sup>	Pier Fishing Competition
	8 <sup>th</sup>	Talk – ‘The Marine Diversity of the Strait of Gibraltar’
<b>October 2005</b>	6 <sup>th</sup>	Talk – ‘The Battle of Trafalgar – Prelude and Aftermath’

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 624 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are any of these, events which would have taken place anyway and which have had the word 'Trafalgar' added onto the title or are they planned specifically because of the bicentenary?

**HON F VINET:**

It is a combination really, one will see for example that from 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> October the Calpe Conference takes place, that is an annual event but of course this year we have chosen a particular theme that suits the bicentenary. So it is a combination.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Looking through the list that the Minister has supplied is it true to say that all the events on this list are taking place in Gibraltar then, there are none taking place in the United Kingdom is that correct?

**HON F VINET:**

Just having a cursory glance on those events I can confirm that is the case.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister where the statue of Lord Nelson is going to be located?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, the statue of Lord Nelson which is being unveiled on the 28<sup>th</sup> November will be situated opposite the Trafalgar Cemetery. If the hon Member cares to walk around that area he will see that some preparatory works are taking place.



ORAL

**NO. 625 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state how much money has been allocated to GJBS for monitoring, supervising and conducting other works carried out at the Old Theatre Royal site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 626 of 2005.

**NO. 626 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

How much has been spent on the Old Theatre Royal site in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 2004 and 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Government have appointed the structural engineering section of the Technical Services Department to regularly monitor the condition of the site. Any works deemed necessary are then instructed through No. 6 Convent Place and carried out by GJBS which maintain the site in a clean order. No fixed sum is allocated in this regard.

The amount spent on the Old Theatre Royal site is as follows:-

<b><u>Financial Year</u></b>	<b><u>Amount</u></b>
2000/01	£ 221,467
2001/02	£1,221,467
2002/03	£ 699,917
2003/04	£ 912,450
2004/05	£ 135,182
2005/06	£ 13,122

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 625 AND 626 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to this year's expenditure, £13,122 I think he said, can the Minister state what that expenditure was for?

**HON F VINET:**

No, I recall there was a question in a previous meeting of the House asking for a detailed breakdown of expenditure for the last year, I am afraid I would need notice of that degree of detail required but I will certainly provide the hon Member with the information requested, but as I stand on my feet I have not got those details with me.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I asked this question because £13,000 is much less obviously than what is paid, does this include the 2004/2005 backwards does it include the rent to the owners or are these expenditures, for example for the demolition works, the excavation work and all that.

**HON F VINET:**

As has been explained in detail in previous questions I have had the opportunity of looking at this does not include the rent.

**HON S E LINARES:**

All these figures have to be totally readjusted because the question asks how much has been spent on the site, the rent to the owners is an expenditure on the site.

**HON F VINET:**

I would argue that is a matter of opinion on which I do not share with the hon Member. The question asked how much is being spent on the Theatre site, I think it is perfectly arguable that it is works that have occurred on the site as opposed to the rental of the site itself.

ORAL

**NO. 627 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**PEOPLING BY HOMINIDS QUATERNARY MEETING**

Can Government state how much money was spent on the Iberian Peninsular and its Peopling By Hominids Quaternary Meeting, which the Minister for Culture inaugurated on the 26<sup>th</sup> September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The answer is £1,754.40.

**NO. 628 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**MUSIC CENTRE**

Will Government state how much has been given as a grant to the trustees of the Music Centre in the years 2004, 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The sum of £13,000 in the financial year 2004/2005 and nothing to date in this financial year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 628 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I remember asking a similar question about a year or a year and a half ago and I remember the previous Minister stating that £52,000 was allocated for the old BFBS building in order for it to be refurbished, is it that the Government gave those £52,000 already to the Music Centre to do the refurbishment and that these £13,000 are now extra over and above those £52,000?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, if I remember correctly those £52,000 related to the refurbishment of shutters and the like and the £13,000 I have referred to are made up of the following: a cultural grants vote which is for the purchase of three clarinovas, one drum kit and musical software, all of these are for the use of the students and £10,000 from the I&DF vote for the purpose of repairing and replacing the shutters at the premises. I would not be able to say what the £2,000 were used for.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It would be interesting to note because if one takes time and goes to see the place it seems as if from the outside because I have not had the privilege of going inside, from the outside nothing has been done. In fact the building seems to be deteriorating by the day and therefore I would ask the Minister if he could give a breakdown of those £52,000 which were given to the trustees because I am sure that when the Government give the trustees £52,000 for a specific job which is for the

refurbishment of the building that the Government get accounts back as in how they spend the money. The trustees could not get the £52,000 saying 'I am going to do the building' and now then start buying instruments for example. There is a specific duty on the trustees to spend that money on the building and it seems as if the building does not have new shutters, it seems as if the building is slowly crumbling and it would be interesting to know where the £52,000, obviously he has given an explanation as to where the £13,000 in instruments goes but I would be interested to know.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

If I may because the question of the £52,000 precedes my colleague, yes I think if the Opposition Member went inside he would realise that a lot of work has been done on what is a big and old building. Precisely part of those £13,000 were earmarked towards the end of my time in heritage for the shutters precisely because they give the wrong impression. If one approaches the building and shutters are not in good condition one may think that the whole of the building is not, structurally it is sound, I think that they have been looking at the question of the balcony which we were not happy about as well but a lot of work has occurred inside which is obviously the main thrust given by the trust when they obtained the building from Government, who of course are very interested in continuing to support the arts. So it is used by young people for music but still works need to be done by the trust, after all it is a trust and it is their responsibility but the Government of course are supporting financially.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Has there been a change in management in the Music Centre since the last time, I believe that the lady who was running it before is no longer running it and now there is somebody else? Can the Minister confirm this.

**HON F VINET:**

I am not aware but certainly, as has been explained previously, the Gibraltar Music Centre is a charitable trust and the trustees are not appointed by Government and it is they, the trustees, who run the Music Centre. It is entirely up to them how to manage their business and who manages it but I am not aware of any changes.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state who appoints the trustees? He has just stated that the Government do not appoint the trustees, who then appoints the trustees?

**HON F VINET:**

The information before me is that Government do not appoint the trustees.

**NO. 629 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CULTURE – ANNUAL FAIR**

Can Government state how much was collected from associations, charities, groups and others for mounting stalls and/or bar/cafeteria facilities at the fair and National day respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Nothing is being collected from charities. I will let the hon Member know how much is collected once all the monies are received.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 629 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the Minister can confirm that monies are collected from associations and groups and others but not charities?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes as has always been the case.

ORAL

**NO. 630 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CULTURE – NATIONAL DAY**

Can Government state what was the cost of the National Day celebrations 2005 including expenses for visiting MP's and others, fireworks and other functions giving a breakdown by event?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

I will let the hon Member know once all invoices are received and accounts settled.



**NO. 631 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE ORDINANCE**

Can Government say whether the new Heritage Ordinance, or amendments to the existing one, have now been drafted and been considered by Ministers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

A draft does exist but this is still being reviewed. Ministers have not yet approved a Bill.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 631 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is this the same draft which was circulating for a number of years which was prepared by the previous Minister for Heritage who is now no long in this House, Mr Azopardi? Is that the same draft or is it a new one?

**HON F VINET:**

I would not be able to say whether it is the same draft that has been doing the rounds for a number of years. It has certainly been ready for some time and I hope the hon Member will appreciate that I am presently familiarising myself with its contents. The proposed amendments are extensive both in number and in their actual effects and I am therefore in the process of looking at those amendments and comparing it to the present Ordinance and that does take some time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In what timescale does the Minister envisage that this process will be completed? My understanding is that this is now with his Department before it goes on to Council of Ministers for discussion between his Ministerial colleagues.

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, as I have said the effects of the proposed amendments are wide-ranging and that is why the Council of Ministers will be having a detailed look at those proposed amendments. I would not be able to give a time frame but certainly my intention is to deal with the matter as soon as possible.

**NO. 632 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CULTURE – WORLD HERITAGE SITE**

Have Government now taken a policy decision to ask the United Kingdom to put forward a bid to include all or part of Gibraltar as a World Heritage Site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 632 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is this a matter which is being pursued or which the Government had not taken a policy decision the last time this question was raised in the House, is it a matter which is being discussed and no policy decision has been taken after the discussion or has no discussion taken place?

**HON F VINET:**

This is a matter that is currently being pursued and actively so. I recall having been interviewed by the Gibraltar Chronicle shortly after the Ministerial re-shuffle and I gave a reply which I am happy to refer to in this House. That is that the Government are carefully studying the scope and the detail of Gibraltar's future bid for World Heritage Status. The Heritage Division is currently embarked on a detailed research and study exercise of the heritage aspects that will be included in such a bid and this information will be used to clearly delimit the properties to be included with a view to ensuring a bid that is well prepared and one that has the maximum chances of success. I said in that interview and I repeat today that I think it is important for this work to be carried out in a measured, unhurried and responsible way and it will take as much time as it needs to take.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I understand that when we are dealing with heritage, whether it is the Heritage Ordinance or the application for World Heritage Status we are dealing with history and perhaps these things take time, but I think part of the objective is surely to

preserve some of that history and some of that heritage for future generations, particularly in the current climate of developments. Can I ask the Minister because the question is a two part question it mentions either to include part or all of Gibraltar as a World Heritage Site, have the Government taken a policy decision in that respect? That is to say, whether they will include if they do go ahead with this all of Gibraltar or simply parts of Gibraltar in their application?

**HON F VINET:**

This is one particular issue that is being looked at. I am aware that the Chief Minister mentioned in the House some time ago that there were some concerns that arose as a result of the possibility of the whole of Gibraltar being considered concerned with regard to future development plans and so on, so that is one of the issues that is being looked at but certainly what Government and in particular the Heritage Division are doing is trying to ensure that whichever plan is presented by the UK for World Heritage Status stands the best possible chance of success.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has pre-empted my next question but if he could just confirm that this is how I have understood it. The supposition is at present that we make a bid to the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom includes that bid as part of its own application for World Heritage Status in terms of Gibraltar/UK and then it has to be approved, it is not automatic, once the UK puts the application forward it then has to be considered and then approved or not by the pertinent authorities, is that the case?

**HON F VINET:**

That is correct, there is an in principle agreement with the UK or rather UK agrees to nominate Gibraltar as one of its list of sites and therefore, as the word implies, it is an application and that has to be either accepted or not.

**NO. 633 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR HERITAGE TRUST**

How often and on what dates, in 2004 and 2005 to date, has there been consultation between the Heritage Division of the Government and the Gibraltar Heritage Trust and over what issues has this consultation taken place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Contact between the Heritage Division and the Gibraltar Heritage Trust is regular and wide ranging. There is additionally a formal forum that is separate to the contact that happens on an ad-hoc basis, that formal forum is known as the Heritage Action Committee (HAC), which I chair and includes representatives of the Division, the Trust and other Government agencies. HAC meets on a regular basis. Meetings in 2004 and 2005 were as follows:-

22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2004  
4<sup>th</sup> March, 2004  
6<sup>th</sup> May, 2004  
26<sup>th</sup> October, 2004  
30<sup>th</sup> November, 2004  
8<sup>th</sup> February, 2005  
13<sup>th</sup> April, 2005  
20<sup>th</sup> July, 2005  
21<sup>st</sup> September, 2005

The next meeting is scheduled for the 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 2005.

In addition, since taking over the Ministry, I have initiated a series of visits to heritage sites to familiarise myself with specific issues. These have been approximately on a monthly basis. They have involved the Division and, where relevant, the Trust. So far I have visited the Gibraltar Museum, Gorham's Cave and the recently opened World War II and 18<sup>th</sup> Century tunnels.

**ORAL**

**NO. 634 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether or not the Government have advertised vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 635 to 640 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 635 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

How many additional posts do Government consider will be required to run the new and the present facilities at the Victoria Stadium site, and can they give a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 and 636 to 640 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 636 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm how many personnel have been recruited to date to run the new facilities by the Gibraltar Sports Authority at the Victoria Stadium site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634, 635 and 637 to 640 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 637 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can Government state how many persons have been recruited to date by the Gibraltar Sports Authority and can they give a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 636 and 638 to 640 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 638 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can Government state of the persons employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority how many are employees of the Crown and how many are employees of the Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 637, 639 and 640 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 639 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can the Government state when the new sporting facilities they promised to provide at the Victoria Stadium site, which are still not fully operational, will be ready for use by the public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 638 and 640 of 2005.

**NO. 640 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Will the Government provide parking facilities for the users and spectators of the sporting facilities at the Victoria Stadium site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority were advertised in June and September 2005.

In addition to staff who transferred from the Sports Department, nine new employees have to date been recruited by the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority to run the facilities. They are:-

- 1 Facilities and Resources Manager
- 1 Assistant Sports Development Officer
- 6 Sports Assistants
- 1 Administration and Clerical Officer

Of course, as more facilities become available the situation regarding staff requirements will be monitored according to the Authority's needs.

In answer to Question No. 638, all persons employed by the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority are employees of the Authority.

In answer to Question No. 639, it is programmed that the whole project be completed by the end of this financial year.

In answer to Question No. 640, Government will not be providing more parking facilities at the new Bayside Sports Centre.

**NO. 641 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government provide an estimate of the cost of re-opening Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

The cost is not known but Government estimate that the project under consideration might cost about £4.6 million. No decision has been taken whether or when to proceed with this project.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 641 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister say or give a date by which time this decision will be taken since it seems to have been on the table for a very long time and seeing that there is an estimate of cost now?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No I am not in a position to actually tell the hon Member a specific date for commencement of the work. All I can tell him over and above this is that there are still some investigations actually being taken on the actual ground in the area but I am not in a position to tell him when the actual work will start as the hon Member would wish to know.

**NO. 642 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state when they expect to complete the works on the project to enhance the state of the cemetery and the estimated cost of the project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

The project for the refurbishment and beautification of the North Front Cemetery will shortly go out to tender, it is therefore not possible to give an accurate indication of when the works will start on site until an award is made. The project has a programmed duration of nine months. It is not considered appropriate to provide estimated costs for the project until the tender process has been completed.

**NO. 643 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government provide an update on the status of the tender for the Sewage Treatment Plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

A consultant has now been appointed to assist Government with the delivery of this project and work has already started in undertaking a preliminary study and assessment that precedes the procurement of the project. It is envisaged that this study will be concluded within the next few months.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 643 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister state who is responsible for conducting the studies, whether they have engaged an outside firm et cetera?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Following the interest expressed by Multiplex in relation to this project Government have decided to undertake a public sector comparative exercise the results of which will enable them to be better placed to consider Multiplex's proposal or indeed any other proposal received, and assess whether they offer good value for money. Included as part of this assessment is an overview of the available technology as it is a high risk element due to the uniqueness of our situation vis a vis seawater borne sewage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then what is it that all the previous technical studies have been establishing? Surely this business of the seawater was known from the very beginning and there have been a number of studies announced prior to this one which have been carried out by external experts. So what is different that needs to be studied now that has not already been studied?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I am not very much informed of the details of the previous study but I do know that as a result of the interest expressed by Multiplex we are undertaking this public sector comparative exercise to undertake to see what are the best options to see whether we get good value for money in relation of developing further, but I cannot draw the distinction that the hon Member wishes me to draw between the exercise being provided by the previous tenders and this one unless of course formal notice of his question is given to me to be able to give him the proper answer he would wish to have.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Minister familiar with the results of the previous studies?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No I am not familiar with the previous ones I am actually going through the motions in relation to this one but I am not familiar with the details of the other one.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But the Minister will know that in fact in previous questions in previous Houses the information that the Government have been providing was that all the technical work that needed to be done was already being done, now what appears to be new in the answer is this public sector comparator. Is the Minister then saying that what they are looking at is whether it will be more cost effective for the Government to do it as opposed to Multiplex doing it, is that what he means?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Well, we have not yet concluded whether that will be the fact or not we have not come to that conclusion, that is one of the things that we would wish to know in a position once we do the public sector comparator in terms of the options available to us as a Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know they have not got the answer yet, my question is does by using the phrase "public sector comparator", to me public sector comparator means comparing whether it is more effective to do it in the public sector or in the private sector, is that what he means when he says public sector comparator and if not what is it that is being compared with what?

**HON J J NETTO:**

For me the public sector comparator means what would be the cost in comparison with other perhaps public utilities but at the end of the day whether the Government decide, which have not decided yet, whether they will take it upon themselves or if



someone will take it on behalf of the Government is an option that needs to be decided at the end of the exercise.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I seem to be having difficulty in the Minister understanding the question. I am not questioning the decision that needs to be taken at the end of the exercise before the exercise is commenced, what I am trying to establish is what the exercise is intended to produce. What is it that the exercise that is being conducted is intended to produce, is it to take the Multiplex proposals and compare them with an alternative which would be the Government doing it or is it to take the Multiplex proposals and compare them with what other people are doing elsewhere?

**HON J J NETTO:**

My understanding is the latter but it also means as well that there are various options in terms of the technology in relation to the type of plans and all of that also will be part of the exercise as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the Multiplex proposal forms part of the East Side contribution for the development to the Government in terms of providing resources as opposed to providing cash, would in fact looking at a possible alternative to Multiplex mean that that element of the Multiplex package would then have to be renegotiated?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I am afraid I am not in a position to be able to talk about renegotiating the whole package, this is something which I have not dealt with and perhaps probably the Chief Minister is in a position to answer that question because he has been leading on that particular issue, but I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am trying to establish is presumably there is a value attached to this so if that was not done by Multiplex presumably something else will have to be done in its place or paid in its place, would that be a reasonable assumption or not?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes I think that is a reasonable assumption.

ORAL

**NO. 644 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's Public Highways that were resurfaced during the semester ended 30 September 2005 and the cost of the resurfacing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 645 and 646 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 645 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's Public Highways that they propose to resurface during the semester ending 31 March 2006, providing a breakdown by quarter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 644 and 646 of 2005.

**NO. 646 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS**

Can Government state how much they have spent in the period April to September 2005 on Road Maintenance and Resurfacing – Head 103 – 7?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

During the current financial year a total of £84,294 has been spent on highways maintenance. This has been limited to dealing with emergency repairs and minor works pending the award of the Highways Term Maintenance Contract.

The latter was awarded on the 5<sup>th</sup> October 2005 and work will commence on the maintenance programme shortly. Major works will continue to be let out to tender with individual schemes being announced as and when they are to be executed, as has recently been the case with the Engineer Lane and Bell Lane beautification contract.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 644 TO 646 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The reason for this question is to determine or rather to have a view as to which are the areas that Government plan to resurface in the next six months, just forward planning.

**HON J J NETTO:**

I think that the answer would be as my answer implies that we now have a measured term contract which is in place and has been awarded and by the nature of that particular contract, the measured term contract, the contractor who has now been given the contract will do minor response maintenance type of work but whenever a big job is done, like the one that was recently announced in Engineer Lane and Bell Lane, that would go out to tender. The hon Member asks whether we have a programme, yes the Department do have a programme but it is not customary for us in the House to actually list the programme because we would not want to anticipate or give information to contractors in relation to the actual programme. That has never been the practice in the House and I do not think that it is actually necessary.

Suffice it to say that whenever big schemes are scheduled for coming out publicly we would announce during the course of the financial year.

ORAL

**NO. 647 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government state whether the five vacancies at Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners have now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

The five vacancies were filled at the beginning of September 2005.

**NO. 648 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CALPE TENANTS ASSOCIATION**

How many times has the Minister for the Environment met the Calpe Tenants Association since the last meeting of this House for Questions in April and what action is now envisaged will be taken to tackle the problem of unsightly and unhygienic rubbish dumps in the area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

No further meetings have taken place with the Calpe Tenants Association since that communicated by my predecessor in reply to Question No. 144 of 2005.

Government have since accepted the recommendations made by the department at the time, with the following action having been taken:

1. A revised design for the bin cubicles has been prepared and is presently being priced.
2. Funding has been made available to the department to undertake this work.
3. Three bin cubicles are intended to be tackled. The first of these will be at the area of Calpe Married Quarters, the second in the area of Willis' House and the third at Willis' Road. The enclosure at Willis' Road will be a temporary one as that area is subject to review due to other projects currently being considered for this location.
4. The assistance of the Royal Gibraltar Police has been sought to ensure that the law is strictly enforced in relation to the feeding of the apes.

It is considered that on completion of the scheduled works and with the cooperation of the RGP the desired effect will result. Despite this, the department will continue to closely monitor the situation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 648 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us when he envisages that the works will start in the three areas of the bins?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I can envisage the works starting before the end of this financial year.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Financial or calendar year?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Financial year.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister be surprised to hear that despite everything he has said about enlisting the assistance of other authorities et cetera, in fact the problem has just been getting even worse and the apes are getting even braver and are now taking to attacking people as they walk past with their plastic bags much more than they used to do before and they continue to be fed by some of the residents?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Well, I hear what the hon Member says and I think he is echoing some of the views that have been manifested in the press lately, I think there have been a few letters to that effect I remember reading some of them and there seems to be some truth in what the hon Member seems to be saying.



ORAL

**NO. 649 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Can Government confirm how much of the grit mountain at Cammell Laird has now been removed, where it has been removed to, how much remains and what the cost of removal to date has been?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 and 651 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 650 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Can Government confirm if they have sought and obtained a commitment from Cammell Laird that there will be no further accumulation of grit at that Company's ship yard and what systems are being engineered by the Government to ensure they do not re-accumulate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 649 and 651 of 2005.

**NO. 651 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Are Government satisfied that the 'dampening' being carried out by Cammell Laird is sufficient to ensure that the grit mountain in that Company's shipyard is not causing environmental pollution to residents in the area of the south district?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Government welcome the removal of the grit mountain from Cammell Laird and, based on the advice that they have received from the Environmental Agency, are satisfied that no nuisance is being caused as a result of this to the residents of the south district.

By close of play on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2005, approximately 1,440 tons of grit out of a total accumulation of about 8,000 tons had been removed from the Cammell Laird shipyard. It has been sent for proper disposal to the Gamasur Campo de Gibraltar SL site at Los Barrios. The movement of this waste is being carried out in accordance with the provisions of the transfrontier shipment of waste legislation and it has been approved by the Gibraltar and Spanish competent authorities.

The total cost of the removal of the grit mountain is estimated to be £360,000.

Government have obtained a commitment from Cammell Laird that there will be no future accumulations of grit in the shiprepair yard. This is an issue that is of importance to the Government.

In essence, now that a system for exportation of the waste grit to a proper disposal site has been put in place, grit will be exported at frequent intervals whenever sufficient quantities have been accumulated to make up a load. Temporary storage of the grit will be within a dedicated tank that the company will install specifically for this purpose.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 649 TO 651 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us how much is a load?

**HON J J NETTO:**

As my original answer implied the load is the load sufficient for a lorry to be taken.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand that, I did not mean a load as in normal English, how much is a load, how much is each tanker going to carry so that we know how much? The Minister should know.

**HON J J NETTO:**

My hon Friend says it is about 40 cubic feet so I take his extreme knowledge on the subject as accurate.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think to be fair to the Hon Mr Britto what he is saying is that the container is traditionally 40 cubic feet, but we have not been told that the container is going to be used we have been told that a lorry load is going to be used. Now, different lorries carry different weights do we know how much it is that the lorries that move this type of grit move?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No I do not know what type of lorry the company who are engaged for the removal use, there are different lorries of different sizes and I am sure they will get along and fill it in and take it away.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Fair enough, there is nothing more honest than somebody who says they do not know, if they do not know they do not know but of course we are being told that the Government are paying for this, we were told it was going to cost £500,000 and now we are told it is going to cost £360,000. Who will pay for the onward, after we have dealt with the 8,000 tons that there are there who will pay for the continued costs as and when there are accumulations?

**HON J J NETTO:**

My understanding is that it will be the company.

ORAL

**NO. 652 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Will the Government confirm to the House what has been the monthly operating cost of operating the air quality monitoring stations set up in compliance with EU obligations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 653 to 657 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 653 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Can the Government confirm that the total cost of £411,000 paid to the Environmental Agency in respect of the air quality monitoring stations is inclusive of the £18,000 paid to NETCEN, the UK consultants employed in connection with the establishment of the monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 652 and 654 to 657 of 2005.

**NO. 654 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Will the Government state what the monthly operating cost has been of operating the website [www.gibraltairairquality.gi](http://www.gibraltairairquality.gi) which will provide information as to the air quality readings picked up by the air quality monitoring station?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 652, 653 and 655 to 657 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 655 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

What concerns if any do Government have about the spikes in the recorded level of Benzene, Ethyl Benzene and mp-Xylene recorded by their air quality monitoring stations in respect of the period between 1 May 2005 and 1 October 2005 in the region of Rosia Road and what action, if any, are Government taking in this respect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 652 to 654, 656 and 657 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 656 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Why is there no record maintained on the Government's air quality monitoring site, [www.gibraltairquality.gi](http://www.gibraltairquality.gi) about the levels of Benzene, Ethyl Benzene and mp-Xylene recorded by their air quality monitoring stations in respect of the period between 1 May 2005 and 1 October 2005 in the region of Bleak House which thus does not allow users to plot the levels in graphic form?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 652 to 655 and 657 of 2005.

**NO. 657 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Given the Government's stated commitment to improve air quality in compliance with their legal obligation, what non-permanent air quality monitoring exactly have the Government carried out to ensure the quality of air in the area of Winston Churchill Avenue and Devil's Tower Road is monitored?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Figures for the annual operating costs of the monitoring stations for the three years from 2005 to 2007 have already been provided in answer to a previous question (No. 145 of April 2005). These amount to £411,150 over the three years. For the first year, that is 2005, the monthly operating cost equates to £12,550.

The £411,150 figure is an all-inclusive sum that includes the cost of the establishment of the website and running of the same. The figure however, does not include the cost of the £18,600 of the NETCEN report.

The spikes in the recorded levels of Benzene, Ethyl Benzene and mp-Xylene at the Rosia Road monitoring station are considered to generally correspond to peaks in traffic conditions. These are expected results from a roadside monitoring station. The standards for these pollutants set out in our legislation and in EU Directives correspond to limit values averaged over a calendar year. Monitoring at Rosia Road started as from February 2005. We therefore do not have sufficient data to be able to compare directly to these standards but, from the data available to date, it would appear that we will be below these set values.

The monitoring station at Bleak House is considered a "Suburban/rural background" station and, as such, is designed to monitor ozones and oxides of nitrogen only, as the hon Member has previously been informed in answer to Question No. 2120 of December 2004. Although there is therefore no automatic monitoring of Benzene, Ethyl Benzene, mp-Xylene at this station, there is a diffusion tube sampling point (non-automatic) located at this site, the results of which are available on the website under "Non-automatic monitoring data".

In addition to the automatic monitoring stations, Government have set up an extensive passive diffusion tube-sampling programme. The siting for these sampling points was decided following advice from consultants engaged by Government. These samplers are used to provide average concentrations over periods of four weeks and monitor for nitrogen dioxide and hydrocarbons (benzene, toluene,

ethylbenzene and xylenes) and are deployed in the following locations either in or in the proximity of the area referred to in the question:

- Hydrocarbons - Glacis Road, Kings Lines, Laguna Estate, Devil's Tower Road, Catalan Bay Road
- Nitrogen dioxide - Glacis Road, George Don House, Devil's Tower Road

These samplers provide information of spatial variation of pollutant concentrations and elucidate peak background concentrations, thereby providing specific and accurate information of conditions at these sites.

As previously stated NETCEN were engaged by Government in 2003 to carry out a preliminary assessment of air quality for the pollutants regulated by the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Daughter Directives on ambient air quality. A requirement for Member States to conduct such an assessment is specified in Article 5 of the Framework Directive on Air Quality (Council Directive 96/62/EC).

The objective of the preliminary assessment was to establish estimates for the overall distribution and levels of pollutants and to identify monitoring requirements in order to fulfil the obligations to the Framework and Daughter Directives and our own transposing legislation.

The Environmental Agency were subsequently engaged to operate the monitoring stations for Government with the following being a breakdown of the £411,150 cost covering the three year period 2005 to 2007:

Year 1 (2005)	£150,600
Year 2 (2006)	£131,350
Year 3 (2007)	<u>£129,200</u>
Total	<u>£411,150</u>

The above figure includes the provision of the following service:

- Quality control data management and data dissemination services in respect of the data obtained from the two monitoring stations;
- Service and maintenance of equipment and the audits of equipment and data.
- Implementation of a passive diffuse sampler programme to obtain further information of spatial variation of pollutant concentrations and elucidate peak and background concentrations.
- A scooping study to identify the availability of appropriate and cost effective data sets for the characterisation of transboundary pollution episodes, natural pollution events and source apportionment of measured PM<sub>10</sub> levels within Gibraltar.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 652 TO 657 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that very full answer from the Minister but I am very concerned that he does not seem to really address the issue that is clearly of the greatest of concern and set out in particular in Question No. 655, the spikes in the Benzene, Ethylbenzene and mp-Xylene. I have got copies here of the graphs that are produced using the Government's own website which I shall pass him a copy of. From the graph it is possible to see that there is one particular, there are a number of spikes which I can see probably are related to traffic, but there is one particular spike going almost to the top of the graph on the first graph which is benzene; on ethylbenzene there are a number of three or four very worrying spikes; on mp-xylene there are five very worrying spikes and on the Government's own website the definition of benzene states very clearly it is a known human carcinogen. Now I know that the Minister tells me that none of these spikes affect the annual average but would he be happy to be the person standing by the monitoring station when that particular spike occurs, because I think it is recognised by most scientists that exposure to benzene by an individual does not actually do damage if one is there for a year breathing it in, if one breathes it in on one occasion as badly as this it could cause a serious problem. Now, I do not want to have an argument with him about what the law does or does not provide I am not here to do that, is he not as a citizen and as a Minister representing citizens concerned to see those spikes?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I can assure the hon Member that he is not the only person concerned about this matter, I myself actually took the liberty of looking at the graphs and raising the question. My understanding from the information I have from the Environmental Agency is that it is a suspect reading which is shown in the graph in relation to that particularly high spike. They are looking at it and once they determine whether it is a suspect one or not, in terms of the tube and whether the tube was properly placed in the right place, I will have the answer. Other than that I am told that in regard to the other readings that they are well below the threshold in terms of the legislation and there is no source of concern either to him, to me, or the rest of the community.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am very pleased to hear that this might be a suspect spike, something which I was not told in the original answer but I am very concerned in relation to the other non-suspect spikes that we are still talking about potential averages on what the law provides. Now, can the Minister confirm to the House that he has taken that up specifically that the spikes themselves, that the incidents of greater levels of benzene, mp-xylenes and ethylbenzenes should not create any health concerns, and I assume that he will tell us if he has spoken to the Environmental Agency and to NETCEN about this but has he also got comfort from some medical practitioners?

**HON F VINET:**

Perhaps I might interject in one regard. These spikes the hon Member is referring to we have known from day one according to the reports supplied by NETCEN, these

are perfectly normal in the sense that they come as no surprise. We know that when traffic in the area is at its worst and busiest those spikes will occur and they come as no surprise to Government or to the Environmental Agency. With regard to the one suspect spike that is being referred to I remember having explained to the House when the monitoring station was being put into place that if we were to have spikes that were suspect as this one appears to be we have to bear in mind that there are factors that may contribute towards that, and those will be examined which is the reply that has been given by the Minister for the Environment.

**HON J J NETTO:**

Well, the Opposition Member said would I look into it, he is just repeating what I said previously that I am looking at it and I will come to the bottom of it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful, I do not actually recognise in what the Minister has said now anything that was said already but I am grateful that he is going to get to the bottom of it. Can I take it therefore as a yes that this is an issue of concern and that he is going to get to the bottom of it so that we can all rest assured that this is normal?

**HON J J NETTO:**

It is not an issue for us.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case it is not an issue because the Minister will no doubt confirm to the House that he has had information made available to him by the Environmental Agency and a medical practitioner that none of these issues, forget the law and what the law provides, that none of these spikes is going to cause any health risk to any citizen, not just arguments about things being normal and therefore they come as no surprise. Are they issues which cause health concern and is he happy to allay those concerns and on what basis is he happy to allay those concerns?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I already said that the advice given to me by the experts, which is not us, are telling me that the actual readings as the air demonstrated are well below the values, the thresholds to which we should be concerned to the extent that the hon Member happens to be. I can assure that from the information given to me that he should be able to sleep at night without getting too concerned about it.

**NO. 658 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – NOXIOUS SMELLS**

Can Government confirm the advice provided by the Environmental Agency to members of the public to the effect that the strong noxious smells perceived in Gibraltar during periods of westerly winds are caused as much by bunkering barges docked in Gibraltar as they are by the petroleum refinery and other industries located in the North of the Bay of Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

There have been complaints from members of the public of strong noxious smells. These complaints have been sporadic and, though investigated by the Environmental Agency in conjunction with the Port Department and Bunkering Superintendent, it has not been possible to establish their origin with any degree of certainty. A number of suspect sources have been investigated and a series of measures introduced to abate any possible smells from them. The situation continues to be monitored and there have been no recent complaints.

The Environmental Agency has not issued advice to the effect that the smells are caused as much by bunkering barges docked in Gibraltar as they are by the petroleum refinery and other industries located in the north of the Bay of Gibraltar, even though these sources have been considered along with other possible ones in the course of their investigations.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 658 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I assure the Minister that I have information from members of the public who have come to me who have said that when they have telephone the Environmental Agency the Environmental Agency has actually been the one who has told them the phrasing of my question. In other words, that it comes as much from the bunkering here as what is happening from the north of the Bay, and could he confirm to the House that he is going to take that up with the Environmental Agency so that they can confirm that whether or not they have issued with sounds like something in writing sent out to somebody, that is not also the advice that they are giving on the telephone when people phone up which is my understanding of the position.

**HON J J NETTO:**

As I have said the situation continues to be monitored, they are still looking at them not just the Environmental Agency but indeed the Bunkering Superintendent and the Port Department, they are trying to establish what is the actual source, they have not sort of conclusively come to a decision on what it is and I am sure that they will try to continue to find what is the source and obviously take proper measures if they are measures that we can take obviously within our jurisdiction.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That does not at all address the issue which I asked a supplementary on, which is, will he get to the bottom of whether the Environmental Agency is saying these things to people who phone up to ask about smells. Not whether it is or is not the cause but whether he will get to the bottom of whether the Environmental Agency is saying these things, not in writing perhaps, but on the telephone to people who phone up. He can understand why I am saying he should get to the bottom of this.

**HON J J NETTO:**

If the hon Member wishes to write to me on this particular subject I will certainly take it up with the Environmental Agency.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am asking him in the House whether he will get to the bottom of it. I am not asking him 'if I write to you will you get to the bottom of it', I am saying in this House would he get to the bottom of whether or not the Environmental Agency are saying these things. The answer is fairly simple, 'yes I will' or 'no I will not unless you write to me because I think it is irrelevant'. It is one of the two obviously.

**HON J J NETTO:**

I have not said whether it is relevant or irrelevant, all I am saying is that if he wishes me to pursue it he will have to write to me and I will take it up with the Environmental Agency.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case I will take it as a no.

**NO. 659 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**UPPER ROCK – FIRE BREAKS**

Can Government state whether the Fire Breaks in the Upper Rock have been cleared since the summer of 2004, and if so, when and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

The Fire Breaks in the Upper Rock that are the responsibility of the Government were cleared last summer at a cost of £14,998.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 659 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the Minister says last summer can he give us a date because this is normally done before the summer? The whole purpose of clearing the Fire Breaks is in fact to do it before the summer because it is when the Upper Rock gets very dry and there is a risk.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the Fire Breaks were cleared in the month of June this year. The actual timetable of this is actually not just determined by, I mean there is advice we seek from GONHS for example et cetera as to when the exercise is to be carried out but it is normally in the months of the end of May beginning of June time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was this done directly by Government employees or by using a contractor, and if it was a contractor who was the contractor?

**HON J J NETTO:**

This was carried out by Master Services.



**NO. 660 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ALLOCATION PROCEDURES**

Can Government state whether the changes to the pointage system that came into effect in August this year constitute the major reforms of the Housing Allocation Procedures previously announced or are further measures planned?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Important as this change is it does not constitute the major reforms of housing policy and procedures which Government will introduce during the coming 12 months.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 660 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

As the Government stated in their press release that they would review the situation after the implementation at the beginning of August of the new pointage system what is the feedback that the Minister has received from people on the housing waiting list? Are they happy in general or have there been complaints concerning the new system?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

As with everything there will be a mixture of people who are elated and some who are not quite as happy but I think that is normally the case with every change until the change settles down. There is a period when not everybody receives the amount of positive feedback and positive reaction to their application as they would like until the period of settling down of the system occurs, so it is a combination.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I have also noticed that the Housing Allocation Committee would have to make certain judgements concerning the matter of overcrowding as stated in the press release of 5<sup>th</sup> August, the question I would like to ask the Minister is what yardstick does the Housing Allocation Committee use to determine what is fair and what is unfair?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The question of overcrowding is not quite the same as the question being asked which is to do with the new point system which was solely restricted to the matter of giving greater weighting to waiting time in the application.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In their press release they say that in addition people who have been home owners and who have chosen to sell their homes will not be entitled to go on the public waiting list unless in the judgement of the Housing Allocation Committee the sale was genuinely necessary or there is some other justification for being readmitted. So obviously it seems to me that some special powers are being given to the Housing Allocation Committee to determine which is a worthy case and which is not.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes indeed the Housing Allocation Committee decides on these matters, but what I am saying to the hon Member is that the question refers to one of the aspects of the press release. The hon Member is now asking supplementary questions on what is really another question which is the question of overcrowding or the matter of people selling houses and not being able to go onto the waiting list. I think I have answered the question as it is asked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So does the Minister not then accept that whether a person is given points for overcrowding or not given points for overcrowding is one of the changes to the pointage system which is what the original question is about?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The question refers to one of three changes which is the pointage system. The change in the points was in relation to giving greater weighting to people who are on waiting time, the number of points that they have every year that they obtain every year for waiting. Now quite apart from that there was a question of another change which was persons who sell their homes are not allowed to go onto the waiting list, and the third element of the press release that the hon Member was referring to is the question that if a person sells a house and goes to live with somebody else, parents or whatever, those parents would not be able to accumulate overcrowding points. They are three different issues, the question refers specifically to the pointage system which is one of the three elements.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the Minister then is saying that the question which asked about changes to the pointage system does not refer to the three changes to the pointage system that he has just mentioned, it only refers to one, why does he think that?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, what I am saying is that I am interpreting the question in the manner that I think it has been asked but I have no problem. I think I have answered actually part of what the hon Member has asked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then what we are trying to establish is does the Minister not agree that before the change the pointage allocated for overcrowding was given automatically independent of the cause of the overcrowding.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore this is an important change because there is now an element of discretion where two individual applicants may in the judgement of somebody be treated differently with some people given a higher place on the list and others not being given a higher place on the list. That is an entirely new element in the entire system of allocating points, is that not the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, I think that is not quite correct, I think that there has always been an element of discretion for example within the Social Committee and the Medical Committee that then report back to the Housing Allocation Committee. I understand what he is saying and I think I have answered actually that there is an element of discretion and I am confident that the right procedures are being carried out to make it work.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister has not agreed that this is an element of discretion that has not existed before because he makes reference to the Social Committee but the Social Committee is not there to allocate points, and the question originally as he correctly said was about changes to the pointage system and this is the first time that an element of discretion has been introduced. The pointage system until now was simply a question of measuring the space and dividing it by the number of humans and that decided whether it was overcrowding or not, so what was different before?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No there is no discretion now in the actual points. The points part of the three part change, the point system that people will receive annually for actually waiting is down in a table there is no discretion.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But do people receive points for overcrowding or do they not receive points for overcrowding?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

They do now and they will not in certain circumstances and to that extent there will be discretion.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister not accept that if they do now and before they did automatically and now they may or may not get it, these are changes to the pointage system. Why does he think that changes to the pointage system simply means points for waiting? It is changes to the entire pointage system where a higher weight has been given to the time on the list as opposed to the conditions under which people are living, is that not the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, I think it is a question of interpretation of the question that is all but I am very happy as I am doing now to explain the whole of the system, and I think that very early on I responded to the Opposition Member that in fact I am happy, which I think was the question, am I happy with the way that this is being done the element of discretion that there is and I said 'yes'.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What was the rationale behind the decision to shift the importance in terms of the time people wait to be allocated a house from how long they had been on the list to how bad were the conditions in which they were living, which is what had been the case until now? The balance has been changed towards giving greater importance to waiting time, is that not the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes that is the case.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister explain why it was thought necessary to give this greater importance to waiting time as opposed to living conditions?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, because it was felt that the system as it was before was unfair on those who waited because people would overtake them because of other issues such as overcrowding.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So would the Minister not agree that the implication of that is that they have had evidence which they have analysed of people joining the list and jumping over the people that were already there? Can the Minister give us an indication of the numbers, how big an impact was this having?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes, the hon Member is right, it has been the knowledge for some time particularly of the staff there, particularly of the Allocation Unit, whereby by the previous system which was introduced in 1994 by the Hon Joe Pilcher that with the pre-list a lot of people were accumulating a lot of overcrowding points in the pre-list and automatically as they moved from the pre-list to the waiting list they were being catapulted to the top, which meant that people who were there for a considerable number of years were actually going down rather than seeing themselves going to the top of the list and eventually getting a house. So yes, he is right in as much as saying this is information that was brought to my notice, previously to the Hon Clive Beltran, and it was an anomaly. The system as has been explained to me by people who have been in Action for Housing, like Henry Pinna for the last 30 years, say that in the period of the AACR the actual system in itself was one based on waiting time. That was changed into a system in 1994 when it was previously reviewed, one which was based more on overcrowding points so the accumulation of those points meant that the system had reached a point which was very unfair so to speak to the people who had been there for a considerable period of time. I remember actually doing exercises, not only with my staff when I was there as Minister for Housing but with the Ombudsman, with Action for Housing in terms of trying to help out so to speak, but some people in some of the various waiting lists where there is more scarcity of a particular type of dwelling to try and get them out because they never had the opportunity to get a house because the people in the pre-list kept being catapulted to the top. So the logic behind it now is to try and have a kind of hybrid between the old system and the previous one where it can be as fair as possible. To that degree of fairness, I think that the Government have given a bit of more discretionary power to the Housing Allocation Committee because things may not necessarily fall squarely in the circumstances of individual families between one system and the other, different families, different circumstances which means that sometimes the old system or the previous system may not be as fair as possible and the details and the circumstances of that particular family will have to be analysed by the information in the reports which are taken to the Housing Allocation Committee and try to see how fair they can respond to those particular circumstances.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But in fact, all that he has said about fairness just applies to whether people have justifiably sold their property or not sold their property, that is the only element.

**HON J J NETTO:**

No that is a different thing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well what else is their discretion on then?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The question of selling the houses is a slightly different issue to the extent that, of course, home ownership was a kind of new phenomenon in the 1990's as he is well aware but what happened was, perhaps in the latter part of that decade, that a few cases so to speak started coming out a manifestation of that new phenomenon having now been settled during that decade, where people were selling their houses sometimes because of unforeseen circumstances in terms that the husband or the wife could have been earning a salary, could have lost their jobs through no fault of their own by an accident, an ailment, illness and obviously we tried to help them. But then we soon find out that there was like a kind of crescendo building up, not in that particular category of people, people who have to sell their house for unforeseen circumstances but rather people who were selling their private house in order to try and use the money either to buy property in Spain and then try to get a house from the Government. There were quite a number of cases because of the new situation that emerged as a result of that period in the 1990's and it got to the point that we started looking at cases, I know some of them very well not because I was the previous Minister but because Gibraltar is a small community and we tend to know a lot of people, and there were clearly cases of abuse and we had to do something about it. What we did about it is to say 'well look, what we need to do is to protect the people who through no fault of their own have to sell their house. Those are the ones we have to help and protect and be there for them, but the ones who are thinking of selling their homes with the intention of buying property in Spain or investing their money, or whatever they want to do with their money then what they cannot expect is to do that and then come in and try to get a flat from the Government'. That is the issue that has been addressed in the manner that the Minister has said.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is all very well but that is not the question I asked him. He said in his previous answer that the discretion was not just about people selling their house and then moving in with somebody else and then being given or not being given points for overcrowding. I then asked him if there was something else they had discretion on what was it, and he then gave me a long story about the abuses of the people who sell and move. I am asking him because he said that and if he is wrong he must have made a mistake when he said it. He said in his previous answer that the discretion that this Committee would have to look at where one cannot be black and white and one has to look at all the circumstances was not just about selling and moving in with the in-laws. Now, is the discretion just about the pointage for overcrowding when one moves in or is it not because I have seen nothing else in the Regulations that have been published which provides any discretion in any other factor?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The discretion is when a person sells their home and moves in and the person is stopped from actually applying for a new house unless the Housing Allocation Committee see that it is a worthy case, as it were, along the lines previously described by my hon Friend, or the person is stopped by the Regulations by the person into whose house the person who sold the house moves, the receiving household as it were is stopped from accumulating overcrowding points, again there is discretion there by the Housing Allocation Committee along the lines explained by my hon Friend.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact there is no discretion in the previous answer that he gave me about looking at all the circumstances, the discretion is exclusively limited to two potential parties in accumulating additional points because there is greater overcrowding brought about by somebody selling their private dwelling and moving into a Government rented accommodation, and that is the only discretion that exists.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is what the Regulations state in terms of what can happen when the person tries to move in.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact since that is the only discretion that exists it must follow that this has been put there because there was evidence that people specifically were gaining points as a result of property being sold, because the people that gain points other than from property being sold would still get the points.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That was explained in the Government press release already mentioned.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does he not realise that with the new system that they put in of waiting points, which I put to the Minister, it is incorrect to say that before it was purely on the circumstances of their living conditions, in the previous system that existed until August of this year there were both points accumulated by waiting and points accumulated by the environment in which the person was living. Would the Minister not agree that on the basis of the geometrical progression of points that has now been provided, in fact what will happen is that everybody who has been on the list for four or five years will automatically all be at the top of the list irrespective of how bad the conditions of other people may be.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

If people are living in bad conditions they also accumulate points within the system but I think it has been explained quite clearly by now that what was perceived by Government as being a developing scenario that was unacceptable was people actually, to put it very crudely, jumping the queue and this has been what this element of accumulation of points for extra waiting being given to this waiting time is all about.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But does the Minister not realise that the argument that has been put about the unfair jumping of points is being addressed by whether the overcrowding points would be permitted or not? So the only people that are going to be affected are not the people now who were jumping the queue unfairly because they were selling and then wanting to get back on the housing list, because those will not get overcrowding points. The people who get overcrowding points without having sold, those people will now be penalised and go to the bottom of the list as a result of the additional waiting time. So in fact would the Minister not agree that the system that has been put into place has actually altered the balance between the living environment and the waiting time predominantly to a degree never before in the waiting list, predominantly in favour of people who have been there a long time?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes there are two points, one has been pointed out by my Colleague which is that previous to the change in his time, powers were given to the Housing Allocation Committee to have discretion over these circumstances that can develop. Not only that but the press release that the Opposition Member referred to in the original question, also states that Government will review the situation and change as necessary, I believe that those were the words. So if it is found that there is an overwhelming imbalance Government want to be fair, obviously the necessary changes will occur.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I know that we have been a few minutes discussing this very important issue. The question is a loaded question, it has been very carefully worded to give us a chance to discuss this in the House as the subject matter generally requires. At one point of the discussion I asked the Minister what was the yardstick that the Housing Allocation Committee uses to determine some of these issues, is it by looking at two or three letters? Is it by a member of the Housing Allocation Committee actually interviewing these people, or is that done just by the Housing Manager? I think it is very important because the 300 or so complaints that I have had since I became a Member of the House of Assembly on the housing allocation procedures give me to understand that there are certain issues that obviously the Government will address when further new procedures are put in place.



**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, there is a whole new legislation being prepared which is an in-depth study into all these issues some of which have been highlighted by the Opposition Member. The Housing Allocation Committee take in all sorts of information, information received by the Housing Manager at interviews with individuals and families, letters written in, their experience of course and factors that come to the notice of the Committee in any other fashion. It is a consultation process that also takes in all sorts of information and a decision is then taken.

**HON J J NETTO:**

Could I then just perhaps add over and above what my hon Friend has said in relation to the question, yes there are a number of sources of information that is put before the Housing Allocation Committee which may emanate from the social workers in some cases, some reports may emanate from the Environmental Agency, sometimes even from the Health Authority depending on the case and the circumstances. So there will be quite a brief, not just in the information collected by the Housing Manager and the Housing Manager's staff but it would be quite substantive depending on the case placed before the Housing Allocation Committee, which goes to answer the question the hon Member wanted to know.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Yes, but what worries me enormously is that the impression I get with two year's experience as Shadow Minister for Housing is that the people who actually make these discretionary decisions, and some of them I understand do this on a voluntary basis, all of them, the Housing Allocation Committee, the Medical Allocation Committee, the ones that have to make the decisions do not actually see for themselves the physical state in which these people live and they make decisions based on documentary evidence only and they do not get the chance to see people with the real problems face to face.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member seems to be trying to give the impression if I read him correctly that it is only perhaps himself or Opposition Members who actually take the special interest that is required in going to each and every person on the housing list to find out for themselves what the exact situation is. He will of course accept that if one is the Housing Manager, the Housing Minister or the Housing Allocation Committee where there are many such cases, it is really a physical impossibility to go to all these and also continue with the work at the Ministry. I think that this Government have given ample proof of their social commitment to the elderly, to young people, to students, to youth, to any and every sector of the community and I have, I may be wrong in the impression I gather but if that is what the hon Member is trying to do, to portray a picture where only himself or Opposition Members take the interest in looking in depth at cases of housing then that is totally incorrect, I have to say.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is not answering the question, the question was very clear and the Minister has got up and given a party political broadcast and he has not answered the question. I assume from what he says that he is accepting that he and none of the members of the Committee actually visit the houses.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member who has just stood on his feet is the first one to give political broadcasts from the Opposition benches, I think that I have answered the question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

On a point of order, this is Question Time the Government are here to answer questions, we have been here before they are not here to criticise the Opposition they can make whatever partisan points they want we are not going to criticise that of course this is politics but they are here to answer questions and the question was very clear and what we got was a party political broadcast from the Minister. Can they please be directed to answer the questions, then we will not have this type of crossing of swords?

**MR SPEAKER:**

This is definitely Question Time and I have allowed this particular question to develop into a mini debate and I am quite happy to allow it to develop into a mini debate, because I do feel important issues as all issues debated in the House ought to be at a reasonable length and I must say I did take the view that the last answer by the Minister for Housing did tend to verge on a general defence of his party's approach to their responsibilities as opposed to specifically dealing with the specific point made by the Hon Mr Bruzon.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I was just making a comment on the inference that seems to come, the implication perhaps of the tone of the question.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

May I just correct the Minister? I most definitely do not think that I am the only one who is concerned about housing matters. I hope I will never ever give the impression that I think that I am the only one that does great things because I think I am humble enough to recognise that I do not have that attitude.

ORAL

**NO. 661 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how many Government tenants are currently listed as requiring work to be done in their homes by the Housing Department as landlords?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Buildings and Works software systems are currently being updated and therefore I can provide an estimated figure, which shows that 1,522 Government tenants are currently listed as requiring work to be done in their homes.

ORAL

**NO. 662 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many applicants on the Housing Waiting List to date are medically recommended, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 663 of 2005.

**NO. 663 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many persons to date are medically recommended (excluding those that are described as applicants on the Housing Waiting List) giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 663**

**Answer to Question 662**

There are 33 applicants on the waiting list that are medically recommended as follows:

<b>A</b>	11
<b>B</b>	8
<b>C</b>	14

**Answer to Question 663**

<b>A*</b>	6
<b>A</b>	64
<b>B</b>	56
<b>C</b>	78

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 662 AND 663 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I thank the Minister for the information. I notice that there are 11 applicants medically categorised 'A' in answer to Question No. 662 and that there are six applicants categorised 'A' with an asterisk and then there are 64 categorised 'A' without the asterisk, could he explain that please?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think that an explanation of the asterisk is required, I think that is really an administrative procedure just to show that those six are down for an immediate allocation.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I trust that immediate means within the next few days.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Immediate means as soon as a house is available that suits the requirements of that family. It is not always within a few days.

ORAL

**NO. 664 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated to date starting from December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of 17 pre-war flats have been allocated since 1<sup>st</sup> December 2004 to date.

**ORAL**

**NO. 665 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are currently on the pre-list for housing, giving a breakdown of the flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 666 of 2005.



**NO. 666 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the Housing Waiting List currently, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 666**

**Answer to Question 665**

There are currently 476 applicants on the pre-list as follows:

<b>1RKB</b>	292
<b>2 RKB</b>	37
<b>3 RKB</b>	92
<b>4 RKB</b>	51
<b>5 RKB</b>	3
<b>6 RKB</b>	1

**Answer to Question 666**

There are currently 742 applicants on the waiting list as follows:

<b>1RKB</b>	407
<b>2 RKB</b>	50
<b>3 RKB</b>	195
<b>4 RKB</b>	77
<b>5 RKB</b>	11
<b>6 RKB</b>	2

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 665 AND 666 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I have noticed that there is very little movement in the numbers, can the Minister explain why?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The reason for as the hon Member describes very little movement is because it can be a combination of two factors mainly. One is that not enough flats have been given out as might be hoped for and also that new applicants come onto the list and hence that is why we get a fluctuation of figures.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how many people have moved from the pre-list to the main list since 1<sup>st</sup> August?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not have that information before me, I would require notice to answer those details.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does he have any idea in terms of a ballpark figure, would it be in the 20's or in 10's or what?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not have an idea, I do not have a clear figure on that.

**NO. 667 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF REPOSSESSED FLATS**

Can Government state how many Government flats have been repossessed to date, in the financial year 2005/2006, giving a breakdown of pre-war and post-war?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of eight flats have been repossessed to date as follows:

Post-war	-	7
Pre-war	-	1

ORAL

**NO. 668 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households have received rent relief in each month of the current financial year to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 669 to 672 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 669 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households have applied for rent relief in each month to date, in the current financial year 2005/2006, and how many of these were approved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 668 and 670 to 672 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 670 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households were on full rent relief for each month in the current financial year 2005/2006 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 668, 669, 671 and 672 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 671 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households have had the level of rent relief reduced to date, for every month in the current financial year 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 668 to 670 and 672 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 672 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households on rent relief have had this benefit terminated for every month, to date, in the current financial year 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.



**Answer to Question 672****Answer to Question 668**

The number of households that have received rent relief in each month in the current financial year to date is as follows:

April	-	738
May	-	738
June	-	731
July	-	724
August	-	725
September	-	709

**Answer to Question 669**

The number of households that have applied for rent relief in each month in the current financial year to date, and the number that were approved is as follows:

April	-	7	(6 approved)
May	-	15	(10 approved)
June	-	5	(4 approved)
July	-	6	(3 approved)
August	-	9	(8 approved)
September	-	10	(5 approved)

**Answer to Question 670**

The total number of households on full rent relief for each month in the current financial year to date is as follows:

April	-	107
May	-	103
June	-	101
July	-	94
August	-	92
September	-	90

**Answer to Question 671**

The number of households that have had the level of rent relief reduced for each month in the current financial year to date is as follows:

April	-	71
May	-	62
June	-	48
July	-	58
August	-	57
September	-	45

Contd..

**Cont Answer to Question 672**

**Answer to Question 672**

The number of households on rent relief that have had this benefit terminated for each month in the current financial year to date is as follows:

April	-	12
May	-	18
June	-	14
July	-	9
August	-	20
September	-	22

**NO. 673 OF 2005****THE HON C A BRUZON****HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government state how many tenants have entered into agreements to pay arrears of rent in each month of the current financial year to date, and what is the total of arrears covered by such agreements?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 673**

The following are the number of agreements entered into by tenants to pay arrears of rent in each month of the current financial year:

<b>April</b>	24	£73,679.41
<b>May</b>	21	£46,237.39
<b>June</b>	8	£21,230.05
<b>July</b>	11	£25,781.19
<b>August</b>	10	£28,916.18
<b>September</b>	6	£14,867.98

The total amount covered by such agreements is £210,712.20.

**NO. 674 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

Do Government accept that there are problems of anti-social behaviour in some Government estates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Yes, part of the Housing policy reforms include Anti-Social Behaviour legislation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 674 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I know that this is a manifesto promise on the part of the GSD Government to introduce new legislation but can the Government confirm that this will happen soon?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think that in a previous question I answered that the new legislation would come in within the next 12 months.

**NO. 675 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDING & WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state what progress has been made in the discussions taking place with the Unions regarding the movement of the workforce of Buildings and Works Department into a proposed Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

No such discussions are taking place at the moment.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 675 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will they be resumed because last time I asked a similar question I was told that the discussions were on-going so do the Government propose to resume these discussions?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The contacts that have already taken place before my time have been part of the process whereby Government would arrive finally at a decision as to whether to go down the road of the authority or not. Such a decision has not been taken yet.

**NO. 676 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – AVIAN FLU**

Can Government state how many units of the antiviral drug Oseltamivir (Tamiflu) have recently been ordered and what is the criteria that will be used to dispense the units in the event that a pandemic of avian flu should affect Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

A total of 7000 doses have been ordered. This is based on current World Health Organisation guidance but additional stocks may be procured if the advice changes. The GHA will operate a distribution criteria based on internationally agreed principles and as recommended by the WHO.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 676 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the Minister confirm that a unit will be enough to vaccinate one unit per member of population?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think that is correct but the hon Member has his terminology wrong. This is not a vaccine, this is not an antibiotic it is an anti-viral drug because vaccines have not been developed at this stage and if a pandemic breaks out it will not be expected to be developed in time for us to acquire.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister say whether any other measures have been taken in order to protect the population against avian flu?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

My responsibility is health not environment or public health as such so within the GHA the answer is no.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I say this because I read only yesterday in the Spanish press that the EU has prohibited the import of birds and feathers from Turkey as a measure against protecting their population against avian flu and that there are other bans in respect of the importation of fresh meat. Does that apply to us? Obviously it applies to all Member States so it should apply to us as well.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

As I have just said as Minister for Health that is not part of my remit but as a previous Minister for the Environment I can tell the hon Member that any such prohibition that comes into force within the EU would be applicable to Gibraltar and would be brought into force on the advice of the Environmental Agency.

**NO. 677 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – E111 MEDICAL CARD**

Can Government state the number of residents of Gibraltar that have been issued with the new version of the E111 Medical Card as at 30 September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

A total of 1940 European Health Insurance Cards have been issued as at 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2005. I would draw the attention of hon Members on both sides of the House that this answer differs from what the printed version that we will no doubt be distributed later by the Clerk of the House, this is because I have updated the figures to be valid as from yesterday, what is printed in the answer is at some date in September but these are the up to date figures.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 677 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister say what percentage of the total they expect to issue 1940 is?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have not got a calculator at hand but I can tell him that we calculate the total number of cards to be equal to the population so it would be of the order of 30,000. We have issued 1940 but we have available already for issue a total of 9500 of which the applicants, remember people have to apply to give us the information and the applicants have been or are being advised that their cards are ready and are coming in for collection. I am advised, as of yesterday, that what was a trickle is now mounting and increasing numbers are coming in as the hon Member will see from the printed answer which differs considerably from the 30<sup>th</sup> September to 12<sup>th</sup> October, the figures have practically doubled.



ORAL

**NO. 678 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 of 2004/2005 & 2005/06?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 679 to 684 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 679 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to pharmacists for periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 of 2004/05 & 2005/06 as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 678 and 680 to 684 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 680 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENT TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to pharmacists for the periods 10, 11, 12, 13 of 2004/05, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 of 2005/06, and the comparable figure for the same periods in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 678 and 681 to 684 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 681 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 of 2004/05 & 2005/06 in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to the dispensing pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 678 to 680 and 682 to 684 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 682 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50 for the accounting periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 of 2004/2005 & 2005/06?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 678 to 681, 683 and 684 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 683 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 of 2004/2005 & 2005/06 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 678 to 682 and 684 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 684 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the pharmacists as dispensing fees for periods 10, 11, 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 of 2004/05 and 2005/06?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 684 of 2005****Answer to Question 678**

	04/05	04/05	05/06	05/06	05/06
Period	12	13	1	2	3
Prescriptions	14399	13236	13360	14387	13572
Items	53069	47962	49017	53462	50637
Cost	£605,942.02	£519,320.62	£539,600.33	£562,288.79	£521,718.74

**Answer to Question 679**

	04/05	04/05	05/06	05/06	05/06
PERIOD	12	13	1	2	3
	£79035.92	£67737.47	£70382.65	£73342.02	£68050.27

**Answer to Question 680**

2003/04				
PERIOD	10	11	12	13
PAID	£33061.80*	NIL	NIL	NIL

2004/05				
PERIOD	10	11	12	13
PAID	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

2005/06			
PERIOD	1	2	3
	£88230.60	£96231.60	£91146.60

The foregoing is in respect of completed periods only. Some accounts are yet to be submitted in respect of periods 4,5 and 6 of 2005/2006.

2004/05			
PERIOD	1	2	3
	£83190.60	£84326.40	£83327.40

The foregoing is in respect of completed periods only. Some accounts are yet to be submitted in respect of periods 4,5,6 of 2005/2006.

\* The figure of £33,061.80 differs to the answer given to Question 77 in the last House. Figures for these periods may be subject to change depending on submissions. The total figure will however not exceed £750,000 in any financial year.

contd....



**Cont'd Answer to Question 684 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 681**

	04/05	04/05	05/06	05/06	05/06
Period	12	13	1	2	3
Prescriptions	6414	6040	5826	6473	5915
Items	12337	11711	11347	12730	11519

**Answer to Question 682**

	04/05	04/05	05/06	05/06	05/06
Period	12	13	1	2	3
No. of items	4023	3867	3771	4398	4313

The foregoing is in respect of completed periods only. Some accounts are yet to be submitted in respect of periods 4,5,6 of 2005/2006.

**Answer to Question 683**

When the prescription charges were amended, the Government made all medicines free for all pensioners and additionally, after charging only for the first three items on the prescriptions, supplies all further medicines completely free of charge.

It is not possible to calculate the extra revenue raised with any degree of accuracy but it is estimated to be £30,000 for periods 12 & 13 of 2004/2005 and periods 1,2, 3, of 2005/06.

**Answer to Question 684**

The foregoing is in respect of completed periods only. Some accounts are yet to be submitted in respect of periods 4,5 and 6 of 2005/2006.

2004/2005				
Period	10	11	12	13
Dispensing fees	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

2005/2006			
Period	1	2	3
Dispensing fees	£88,230.60	£96,231.60	£91,146.60

The foregoing is in respect of completed periods only. Some accounts are yet to be submitted in respect of periods 4,5,6 of 2005/2006.

**ORAL**

**NO. 685 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether he is satisfied that since 1998, after the review of the City Fire Brigade was carried out in relation to KGV Psychiatric Unit, the necessary installation of equipment for fire prevention, or the measures required for dealing with the onset of a fire have been adequate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 686 and 750 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 686 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether he is satisfied that the recommendations of the report that was carried out by the City Fire Brigade dated 19 November 1998 in relation to the KGV Psychiatric Unit were implemented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 685 and 750 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 687 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIVATE PRACTICE**

Can the Government confirm that in the event that new contracts for private practice are required for the medical and dental staff of the GHA, which entity have the Government appointed to draw them up?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 688, 723 and 724 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 688 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIVATE PRACTICE**

Can Government confirm whether General Practitioners, Consultants or Dental Officers will need their contracts or their job descriptions changed in order for them to be able to carry out the new private practice arrangements, and if so, have any changes already taken place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 687, 723 and 724 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 689 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CT SCAN**

Can Government state, in view of the answer given by the Minister for Health in reply to Question No. 104 of 2005, whether a suitably experienced Radiologist has now been recruited so that the services of the CT Scan at St. Bernard's Hospital can be initiated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 690, 691, 722, 725 to 728, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 690 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEON**

Can the Minister for Health confirm when did the second Orthopaedic Surgeon, which he said had been recruited during his budget contribution, start working for the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689, 691, 722, 725 to 728, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 691 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CATERING DIRECTOR**

Can Government confirm the salary of the post of Catering Director for the Gibraltar Health Authority, whether the post has been advertised and whether the incumbent of this post has been recruited from outside the Civil Service or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689, 690, 722, 725 to 728, 736, 764 and 768 of 2005.



**NO. 692 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - MEALS**

Are Government aware that there are still many complaints being voiced by patients in St. Bernard's Hospital at Europort, that the quality of the meals being delivered to them in trays, from the kitchen, which is now situated in the old Wine Factory area, is poor and that they are still arriving cold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government are aware of complaints that have been made by some patients.

Food is being served within the temperature parameters recommended by the European Union. However, there have been isolated instances where the temperature of the food has fallen outside these recommendations.

Weekly audits are conducted on the temperature and quality of the food being served. A nutritional link nurse has been nominated at ward level in order to ensure that the meals contain the nutritional content in keeping with the dietetic guidance.

Monthly nutritional meetings are held with the involvement of nursing, catering and dietetic staff to discuss the suitability, quantity and quality of menus.

ORAL

**NO. 693 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CAR PARKING**

Can Government state how much they are paying Morrison's for the use of car parking facilities which are being used by users of St. Bernard's Hospital at Europort, and for what period of time have they entered into this agreement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 694 of 2005.

**NO. 694 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CAR PARKING**

Can Government confirm when the car parking spaces, which they have acquired from the Developers of Euro Plaza, will be available for the public who need access to the Europort Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 693**

Government do not pay anything for the concession offered by Morrisons with regard to the use of the car parking facilities.

This is an open agreement with no time constraints. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank Morrisons for providing this free car parking facility for hospital visitors and Outpatients.

**Answer to Question No. 694**

The car parking spaces acquired from the developers of Euro Plaza will be available once the project is completed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 693 AND 694 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Have the developers informed the Government of the projected completion date?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If they have I am not aware of that, they have certainly not informed me. I am told by my Colleague that the projected termination date of the project is May 2006.

**ORAL**

**NO. 695 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – WATER INGRESS**

Can Government confirm whether all the necessary repairs have already been carried out in St. Bernard's Hospital at Europort, in order to avoid the incidents of water ingress which occurred in many areas of the hospital shortly after it opened?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 696 of 2005.

**NO. 696 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SHOWER SEATS**

Can Government confirm that shower seats for the elderly or disabled at St. Bernard's Hospital in Europort have now been fixed to a proper masonry wall instead of to a plaster board wall as hitherto, which has brought about incidents whereby the plaster board wall has given way and the seats have broken off causing injuries to one patient and recently another incident has occurred involving yet another patient?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 695**

Government can confirm that the few isolated incidents of water ingress which occurred last year have been addressed. These were rectified by the Contractors under the defects liability period at no cost to the Government or to the Gibraltar Health Authority. However, water ingress has occurred as a result of the heavy rains earlier this week and this is also being addressed by the contractor under the defects liability period.

**Answer to Question No. 696**

There have been two incidents involving shower seats which had not been properly anchored during the construction period. Following the first incident and at GHA's request the contractor carried out a risk assessment of all shower seats and confirmed to GHA that all seats were safe for use. However and unfortunately a second incident did occur. Following this second incident the GHA insisted that all seat attachments be removed and a full survey of fixing methods that had been used to be carried out. The contractor has dismantled all fixings and has re-installed or is reinstalling, because it has not quite finished yet, every single seat with reinforced supporting structures. On completion the contractor will provide the GHA with full certification that all seats are now fixed to design specifications as per industry norms.

**ORAL**

**NO. 697 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DIALYSIS TREATMENT**

Can Government confirm whether all patients requiring dialysis treatment are being transported by St. John Ambulance to the Europort Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 732 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 698 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – RENTAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTIES**

Now that the Government have confirmed that properties have been rented to employees of the Gibraltar Health Authority in Harbour Views, Montagu Gardens and Westview Park, where sub-letting is prohibited, have the Government already informed the GHA that they can no longer make available flats in these estates to their employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 699 of 2005.

**NO. 699 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SUB-HEAD 22**

Can Government confirm what is the latest figure for accommodation, under Sub-Head 22 in the Financial Year 2005/2006 of the Gibraltar Health Authority and up to which month does it relate to?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question 698**

The Government and the GHA are still considering the appropriate way to deal with the situation that the hon Member has pointed out to the Government, but no final decision has yet been made.

**Answer to Question 699**

The latest expenditure to September 2005 for accommodation under Subhead 22 for the current financial year is £300,393.93.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 698 AND 699 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

If memory serves me right, not at the last Question Time in the House but at the one before then I think just before Christmas in December, I think the whole House at the time alighted upon the fact that certain individuals in the GHA had made available to them properties in Estates where the lease does not allow sub-letting. It is now ten months since then, when does the Minister think that the consideration that they are applying their minds to in this respect are going to be final so that we know what is going to happen with those properties in the future?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would not like to put a date to it, there is not a cut-off date or a guillotine on this it is a matter where we had preliminary discussions well before the summer, they were



due to be resumed in July and they were not because the agenda of the meeting that took place had to be cut short, truncated, and they were due to resume in September where again the same thing happened and they are due to resume when the twice postponed or truncated meeting takes place, which should be some time between now and December. I cannot really put a date to it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister not agree that this is an issue that is (a) serious; and (b) needs to be resolved quickly because there is a breach here of the Government's own lease as head lessor, by the under-lessee who is allowing sub-letting of their property at Harbour Views or Montagu Gardens. I note that the hon Gentleman is the Head of the GHA but is also a Minister of the Government, both as Government head lessor and as under sub-lettee in his guise as the Minister for GHA is he not concerned that this issue is serious and needs to be resolved quickly?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not agree that the issue is serious in the sense of it being well shaken or that it needs to be resolved quickly. In fact, if one thinks about it the opposite could be said to be the case. Here we have a situation where the Government own or have owned, because it has been identified that all the flats that are currently being let are 100 per cent owned by the current owner, that of course does not affect the terms of the lease but the situation that the Government are considering is that if the leaseings or the rentings stop, effectively it will mean greater expense for the GHA and therefore for the Government, because the pool of properties that are available to the GHA to rent, one must remember that the properties are rented by the GHA and not by the individual and then subsidised, they are rented by the GHA and part-paid by the GHA and the individual pays another part of the rent, so therefore what the Government are seeking to do is to weigh up the situation to see whether there is an advantage to the Government to make a change to the legal situation, if there is a financial advantage to the Government or if there is not. By curtailing the number of properties available, as the implications of the question would seek to do, the rental market in itself shrinks and therefore the rental values rise.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The rental market has shrunk already. From the moment that those leases were created those houses were not available to be sub-let in the way that the GHA is now sub-letting them. Now, before I go down that route can I simply ask the Minister, does he as a Government Minister, as a representative of the head lessor, now accept that that clause in that head lease is not being enforced or is not enforceable?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The clause is a matter, as I have said before in this House, for the management company or the owners and the owner of the property, not for the Government to enforce or not to enforce.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With the greatest of respect to the hon Gentleman, it is a head lease matter which does not forward in the purview of the management company. It is a head lease matter, these properties could not be sub-let. Now, there are many people who are having difficulties in that Estate because they cannot sub-let their properties or because they are wanting to sell to individuals themselves, they want to sell to individuals although they own 100 per cent of the properties, who are not designated individuals. In other words, they are not Gibraltarians, they want to sell to people who are UK nationals, some of whom are married to Gibraltarian nationals. That also is a condition of the head lease. It seems that the Minister is saying, 'well we are not going to apply the covenant against sub-letting because it is applies to us but we will apply it to everybody else as head lessor'. Does the Minister now accept that this actually betray a manifest unfairness in the way that the Government as landlord are implementing the terms of the head lease?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The Government accept nothing of the kind. The red herring which the hon Member seeks to introduce on the question of selling, I will not take up because that is irrelevant to the question on the Order Paper. The issue, as I have said in my answer, the Government are considering the situation and will seek to make decisions based on the situation and will seek to make those decisions in the interests of Gibraltar and in the interests of the taxpayer. I would add that those decisions have not yet been made so there is nothing more I can add.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will those decisions deal with the implementation or the enforcement by the Government, qua-Government and not qua-GHA, of all the negative covenants in that head lease, or simply the ones that deal with the issue of sub-letting which seems to be in the interests of the GHA?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would be better placed to answer that question after the considerations have finished and the decisions have been made.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How long have the Government been aware that the GHA was in fact renting properties which the Government do not allow other people to rent?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think it is probably fair to say since the matter was raised in this House. I certainly was not aware of it before that so I cannot answer for Government collectively on this, but I certainly as Minister was not aware until it was raised in this House.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the Government found out and they were not very clear what the situation was, did they go back and find out how long this had been going on for?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is part of the consideration of the situation as it arises.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If something is known to be in breach of the law which the Government enforce against other citizens, on the premise that these properties have been built for home ownership, it was not permissible is it not the case to buy any of these homes to rent? So if that was the policy of the Government that these houses were only available for home ownership, owner/occupier and not for renting, then having discovered that a Government agency was in fact acting in breach of the legal requirements reflecting Government policy what is it that they have to decide? By condoning the continuation of this are they not deciding that the GHA can dispense with this requirement but it continues to be in force for everybody else?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

For a start, and bowing to the others that have got more experience in legal matters than I have, I do not accept that this is an illegality. This is a question of interpretation of the head lease and the sub-lease and if anybody is in breach it is the owner of the property who is sub-letting in breach of the terms of a sub-lease, not the Government or the GHA. Secondly, part of the issues that are being considered is whether the terms of that restriction continues to be unfair in terms that the owner who is sub-letting is now 100 per cent owner. There are two situations with a view of making possible changes. It is a different situation with an owner who is a 50/50 owner still who would be renting and deriving income from a property that is partly owned by the Government. The situation is obviously different as is the case in all the properties that have been rented by GHA, all those properties are 100 per cent owned by the present owner. Therefore, that is an argument whether the same restrictions should apply but I do not want to pre-empt the issue. As I said at the beginning, the situation is being considered as a whole with a view of either maintaining the status quo or making changes to adjust to make the status quo come within the terms or to prevent the new restrictions that are coming to taking place.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it the policy of the Government that the new properties that are being developed for sale, the so-called affordable housing, should have these restrictions to people who buy them?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is not a valid question to the Minister for Health.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am asking the Government not the Minister. Given the fact that the Minister is in fact defending the position as the person that is renting from the Government.....

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Point of order, point of fact. The Minister is not defending the position, the Minister is saying that the position is under study, under review and under consideration and then he will defend the decision that is made. He has not defended anything yet.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister is defending the position that something they discovered was happening without the knowledge of the policy-makers has been continued notwithstanding the fact that it was not a policy decision in the first place to do this, on the basis that they still cannot make up their minds because they reckon it would cost them more money if they prohibited this. That seems to be the explanation we have been given. The balance is whether if we say one cannot rent for contract officers property in home ownership estates, which were intended for owner/occupiers, then one would have to rent in the open market and therefore the Health Authority would finish up paying more money. So the Health Authority as a health authority has got an interest in keeping its budget under control and that is the position and I can understand it if the Health Authority was a private entity. But of course, my question is that this is not an accident, is it not the case that the policy of the Government from the very first moment that home ownership was launched in our time, and presumably I am asking if it is still the policy of the Government, was that they were offering property for people to buy and occupy themselves not for people to invest in as a business. If we are saying that some people can buy 100 per cent of properties that have got the price fixed and then go out into the market and rent them, then presumably the other investors will argue that this is not a level playing field because they have to pay the full open market price. I am asking the Government, whoever is responsible I think it is the Hon Clive Beltran who is now driving the houses, as I remember the wording of the last press release, in his driving seat in his new housing scheme can he tell the House whether there has been any change in the policy that the people who buy the new houses will not be allowed to rent them?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Before my Colleague answers or not answers that, it is entirely up to him, let me reiterate what I said before. I am not defending any position, what I have told Opposition Members is a statement of facts. I have been asked what the situation is and I have told him what the situation is. He has asked me on what basis the Government are considering changes and I have just put on the table as it were in this House a number of factors which I neither necessarily agree with or disagree with. A number of factors that need to be taken into account before coming to a decision and I reiterate that the position of the Government in relation to this particular issue, not the wider issue of housing in general, but in relation to this particular issue of the GHA renting properties where the owner of the property is in contravention of the terms of the sub-lease, that is what the Government are studying to see whether that needs to be changed or not needs to be changed. At the end of the day, and I am speaking from memory now, at the end of the day I think we are

talking about something between three and five houses, it is not a large number. This is an issue of principle, I am not saying anything to the contrary but there are also contracts in force and there also is an issue of rehousing as well. Again, I am not defending the position, I am just stating that there are a number of issues that need to be taken into account and this is what is happening and this is the discussion that has taken place and is still to take place before a final decision is made.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know whether the Minister is going to volunteer the information to the question that I asked whether there has been any policy change on the part of the Government as to whether the new houses will have a requirement that those who purchase have to occupy them, or whether they will be permitted to rent?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not know, there is no policy change in the 1,500 houses that we intend to build over the next two years.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the 1,500 may not be rented unless the Health Authority rents them surreptitiously, is that it?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I said there is no change in policy.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Finally coming back to the issue of the original question, does the Minister for Health accept that in fact the ten month delay in dealing with this issue is really giving rise to legitimate expectation in anyone who is listening to this debate who owns 100 per cent of their property in any of these estates that they can now start to rent the houses freely?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

First I do not think it is a ten month delay, if I am not mistaken this was raised in April for the first time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, it was first identified in December and we came back to the issue in April when the hon Gentleman said that consultation on what was going to happen was starting, so it is now October, it is ten months since this issue was first aired in the House.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think if I am not mistaken the matter was first addressed in spring of this year but I would need to check that. I do not think that anybody who is listening to this should jump to any of the expectations that the Opposition Member is suggesting that they should jump to. Anybody listening should listen to what I have said and that is if there is an existing situation, that any home owner in any of these developments is prevented from sub-letting according to the terms of his sub-lease, that is still the situation, that the Government are studying that situation and until such time as that review or that study has finished I will not be able to announce what the situation is. No one should jump to any conclusions, either of increased expectations or decreased expectations or any other kind of expectations.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, in fact those are not the facts of what the Minister has said and for his own peace of mind, this was raised in Question No. 132 of 2005 in spring, in April, because it had already been dealt with in an earlier House and there was a follow-up question in April. What he is in fact telling listeners is that the Government discovered over ten months ago that they were renting houses from individuals sub-letting in estates where the head lease did not allow that sub-letting to occur, and that for ten months they have done absolutely nothing about it. Does the Minister not agree with me that that is the message that they are sending out? That when the Government discover breaches of this sort they will do absolutely nothing about them. In any event, especially given that he has told this House, that there is no long stop date for determining this and they are really more determined about how much it is going to cost the GHA to obtain new properties not the principle at stake of people being in breach of the head lease. Is that not the message that people will take from this debate and act accordingly? Hopefully with the benefit of legal advice.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Subject to Hansard proving me wrong, I say again this matter was mentioned in passing in October or November as on the periphery or on the back of another question, but it was not a specific question. It was only identified in April of this year, not ten months ago. It was mentioned, I am speaking from memory subject to correction by Hansard, it was mentioned in passing in November, it certainly was not identified in November, that is point number one. Point number two, I say again and I believe it is the third time and I am not going to say it again, that is the situation, no one should jump to any conclusions, the Government are giving it due consideration and will make decisions as and when they are ready to make those decisions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister mentioned, as if that was something that had weight when looking at these things, that four or five properties are all now 100 per cent owned. Can he say whether they were all 100 per cent owned at the time when they were first rented?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I cannot say one way or the other because I would need notice of that question. I can certainly say that at the time that the question was first asked in April of this year, they were 100 per cent owned. I have no idea for how long they have been rented.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Government must be conscious of the fact that when they sold the 50 per cent to home owners very recently in 2004 at a very reduced price it was on the basis that they were helping people who were owner/occupiers and might have difficulty in meeting, as it were, the full price originally stipulated of 7 per cent per annum. So presumably that is a matter that ought to be taken into consideration as well, at what price the other 50 per cent was bought and when.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

As I have said, the Government are taking all the factors into consideration before they make a decision.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just by way of clarification, in his answer and I direct the Minister to it just for the next time, in page 177 of the last Hansard it is very clear that we identified this in December, that we had a debate about it in December, there was correspondence between him and the hon Member long before April, that we dealt with the issue in April and that the Government accepted then that the GHA had been renting in breach of the lease, because at least in the Chief Minister's words, it had not been taking care to check the underleases. So just to get our time frame right for the next time.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is correct, I remember the correspondence subsequent to October, in which correspondence GHA did not accept that it was in breach and did not accept that it had any action to take at that moment in time. Subsequently, since April, it has become a wider Government issue. Up to April it was a GHA issue.

**ORAL**

**NO. 700 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for study leave up to the end of September 2005, which is included in Sub-head 30, School of Health Studies of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The total expenditure for study leave up to the end of September 2005 is £81,617.22.



**ORAL**

**NO. 701 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm the total number of patients who are presently occupying a bed at St. Bernard's Hospital giving a breakdown by sex and age and in which ward or unit they are in?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 702, 703, 704, 749 and 751 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 702 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF BEDS**

Can Government confirm the total number of beds which there are at St Bernard's Hospital at Europort, also giving a breakdown of how many there are in each ward or unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 701, 703, 704, 749 and 751 of 2005.

**NO. 703 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF BEDS**

Can Government state during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2005, of the beds occupied by elderly persons who have been formally discharged from St. Bernard's Hospital, how many fell into each of the 3 categories identified by the Government specifying sex and age:-

- 1) Elderly persons living alone;
- 2) Elderly persons needing support;
- 3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 701, 702, 704, 749 and 751 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 704 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St. Bernard's Hospital during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 701, 702, 703, 749 and 751 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 705 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR**

In view of the answer given in reply to Question 118 of 2005, that for pay purposes the Complaints Co-ordinator is analogued to the Higher Executive Officer pay scale and the salary is £26,248 per annum, can the Government confirm whether this post forms part of the GHA complement and is it on a contract basis or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 706 to 708 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 706 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been dealt with by the Complaints Co-ordinator to date, which have not been passed on officially to the Independent Review Panel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705, 707 and 708 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 707 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been lodged with the new Independent Review Panel since it started to function at the end of September 2005, from users of the Health Services, specifying the date of each complaint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705, 706 and 708 of 2005.

**NO. 708 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how often the members of the new Independent Complaints Review Panel have now met to consider complaints from users of our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question 705**

I can confirm that the post of Complaints Coordinator forms part of the GHA complement. The post holder is engaged on a contract basis.

**Answer to Question 706**

A total of 90 formal complaints have been dealt with by the Complaints Coordinator to the complainants' satisfaction and have therefore not been referred by the complainants to Independent Review. During that same period when 90 complaints were formulated, 263 commendations from patients in the form of letters, cards, newspapers, advertisements and tokens such as flowers and chocolates have been received.

**Answer to Question 707**

A total of four complaints have been referred to Independent Review by complainants. The office of the Ombudsman gave notice to GHA on the following dates:-

1. 7<sup>th</sup> January 2005;
2. 10<sup>th</sup> May 2005;
3. 13<sup>th</sup> May 2005;
4. 17<sup>th</sup> June 2005



**Answer to Question 708**

As the hon Member already knows from the answer given in this House to Question No. 120 of 2005 the Independent Review Panels are not obliged to inform the Government on how often they meet.

**ORAL**

**NO. 709 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – LEGAL CLAIMS**

Can the Government confirm how many legal claims the Gibraltar Health Authority has received pertaining to the years, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and up to April 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 710 and 711 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 710 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – LEGAL CLAIMS**

Can the Government confirm how much has been spent in meeting legal claims made against the Gibraltar Health Authority pertaining to the years, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and up to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 709 and 711 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 711 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – ANNUAL INSURANCE PREMIUM**

Can Government state what was the level of the annual insurance premium paid to cover medical professionals against claims for malpractice for the years 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 711 of 2005****Answer to Question 709**

The medical malpractice claims for the financial years commencing April 2000 are as follows:-

2000/01	25
2001/02	14
2002/03	32
2003/04	14
2004/05	13

**Answer to Question 710**

The quantum paid in respect of legal claims is as follows:-

2000/01	£296,835.25
2001/02	£16,267.31
2002/03	£2,296,687.75
2003/04	£56,554.09
2004/05	£26,421.40
April to September 2005	£42,437.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>£2,735,202.87</b>

\* Note: Payments made within a financial year may not relate claims made in that particular year.

**Answer to Question 711**

The premia paid to cover the all GHA staff and including the Hospice at Home against claims is:-

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Amount</b>
2002/03	£601,711.40
2003/04	£742,588.00
2004/05	£742,588.00
2005/06	£695,090.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>£2,781,977.40</b>

**ORAL**

**NO. 712 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - CAFETERIA**

Can Government confirm if any seats will be earmarked at the Cafeteria of St Bernard's Hospital for the Medical and Nursing staff?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 713 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 713 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - CAFETERIA**

Can Government confirm that in the event that seats at St Bernard's Hospital's cafeteria will be earmarked for the Medical and Nursing staff and, if so, how many?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government can confirm that an area has been identified for use by the GHA staff, and not only by the Medical and Nursing staff. This area will be used exclusively by staff members once an on-going exercise on capacity in relation to demand is concluded.

**NO. 714 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CANCER REGISTER**

Can the Government state whether they are carrying out an exercise to determine the incidence of cancer in Gibraltar to establish whether or not this is on the increase?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government established the Cancer Registry in 1999, which continues to collect data on cancers. The Registry will shortly commence a quality audit in line with international guidelines and is expected to complete this next year, after that it is planned to produce a report on the incidence of cancers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 714 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is the Minister in a position to say whether since 1999 the incidences reported have been on the increase?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have been warned against drawing conclusions from the figures that I have seen because firstly, the quality audit has not been established that those figures are a correct basis for the data. Secondly, because trends should not be established in this instance on data covering under five years, that is the advice that I have. All that being said and with those caveats, the indications prior to the audit are that the graph is steady and not either going up or down.



**ORAL**

**NO. 715 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can the Government confirm how much is the expected total expenditure in respect of the payments they are making to the NHS Modern Agency, in respect of the Health Care Development Team Programme they have commissioned for our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 716, 717, 718, 719, 721, 761, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 716 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government now confirm how much they expect will be the final total expenditure they will pay to the NHS Modernisation Agency, in respect of the Health Care Development Programme they have commissioned for our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 717, 718, 719, 721, 761, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 717 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can the Government confirm whether they intend to make public the reports of the Health Care Development Team in relation to all its recommendations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 718, 719, 721, 761, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 718 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL REPORT**

Can Government confirm whether they have now received the clinical report on laboratory services, and if so, have they accepted its recommendations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 717, 719, 721, 761, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 719 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL REPORT**

Can Government confirm whether they have now received the report from the Health Care Development Team on clinical services with regard to the KGV Psychiatric Unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 717, 718, 721, 761, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**NO. 720 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DISTRICT COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can the Government now confirm in view of the replies given by the Minister for Health, in answer to Questions 826 of 2004, 1589 of 2004, 2217 of 2004, and 123 of 2005, whether they intend to provide extra resources within the district community service as recommended by the Health Care Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

In Question No. 826 of 2004 the hon Member (meaning the Opposition Member responsible for Health Matters) asked the Government “to verify whether the District Community Services are under resourced...”

In Question No. 1589 of 2004 she again asked the Government to confirm if they agreed with:-

“the comments made by the Health Care Development Team in their report of September 2003 that District Community Services are under resourced...”

In Question No. 2217 of 2004 the hon Member asked whether Government intended “to improve resources within the District Community Services”.

In Question No. 123 of 2005 she invented new grounds on which to base the question by changing the word “comments” used in Question No. 1589 of 2004 into recommendations and asked whether Government intended:

“...to improve resources within the District Community Services as recommended by the Health Care Development Team...”

Today, the hon Member has repeated practically word for word Question 123 of 2005, which incidentally was asked less than six months ago. Well, I would also repeat the answer I gave in April to Question No. 123 of 2005 and that I have given in answer to questions on previous subjects, that the situation remains the same as given in answer to all these previous questions.

No such recommendations, originally called comments and then changed to recommendations, have been made by the Health Care Development Team. Comments which they made in the September 2003 Diagnostic Report are exactly

that “comments” and not recommendations and as such the Government do not have to agree or disagree with them.

It is Government policy to improve all services to the public whenever and wherever possible. Whether this requires an improvement in resources in any particular service is a matter for the Government to consider as part of the many and varied changes that are already taking place within the Health Service.

In the meantime, the Opposition Members should be congratulating the Government for these many changes and improvements to the Health Service. They should stop wasting the time of this House by repeatedly asking this and similar questions at consecutive meetings totally ignoring the answers that are given and not taking them into account when redrafting and asking the same question again.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 720 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister not agree with me that in fact it is not true to say that the same question has been asked twice within six months because the wording of Question No. 720 must be completely new, and it must be completely new because it includes the words “and Question No. 123 of 2005” which is the one that is allegedly being repeated. This question says ‘can the Government now confirm in view of the replies given by the Minister for Health in answer to Question Nos. 826 of 2004, No. 1589 of 2004, No. 2217 of 2004 and No. 123 of 2005 whether they intend to provide extra resources within the District Community Services recommended by the Health Care Development Team?’. Therefore, that question cannot be a repetition as has been suggested by the Minister of the earlier one because it actually mentions the earlier one.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Whether a question is a repetition or not a repetition is entirely the prerogative of the Speaker and far be it for me to judge whether it is or whether it is not. What I have said and I will say again what I read in my answer, ‘the hon Member has repeated practically word for word Question No. 123’ and although accepting that it has the added four or five words, the spirit of the question is exactly the same and on that I will say no more, it is entirely Mr Speaker’s prerogative to make rulings of this nature.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

On the basis that I take that answer to be a withdrawal of the allegation I am happy to leave it at that.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I do not see that as a withdrawal because I was reading the answer as the Minister read it out and the word there is repeated practically and that is all that he has reiterated.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

He used the word, it is a repetition. As Hansard will show he said that it had been repeated within six months, that is a Parliamentary term of art for a question that should have not been put because it has been asked before within the six month period, and that has to be an identical question which this one, in her absence I am happy to say, is not.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Hansard will show that what I said is what is written on this piece of paper which the hon Member will get a copy of within a matter of hours which says, "today, the hon Member has repeated practically word for word Question No. 123 of 2005". That is what I said.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, the hon Gentleman also said something about it being within six months which is about the rule that one cannot put the same identical question within six months. If he is happy to withdraw that then that is fine.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am withdrawing nothing of the kind, I said what I have just read and I ended the sentence with the words "which incidentally she asked less than six months ago". That statement is 100 per cent accurate, I do not withdraw it, I stick to it and it is what I said and what I will repeat again if it needles me further.

**MR SPEAKER:**

The fact that I allowed the question perhaps inadvertently, goes to show that I did not take the view that it is repeating the question verbatim.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not think there are any grounds for not accepting this question but having accepted what the hon Gentleman said in the substance of his reply, are the Government going to provide extra resources within District Community Services as might be necessary to comply with any comments which may have been made by the Health Care Development Team?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not want to go through this again, I have answered this question time and time again. There are no recommendations, there were comments about resources in Community Services, the Government are constantly reviewing their level of resources and if and when the Government judge that the Community Services need to be resourced further, they will be resourced. At this moment in time, as has been the case over the last year and a half that I have been answering the same question,



not always within six months, the Government have to date not made any substantial changes. They may have made minor changes but have not made any substantial changes in Community Services within the GHA. If a need is identified then a change will be made. So far no such need has been identified and therefore they will not be made on the basis of comments that were made in September 2003.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is the answer?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, and I have been saying that for the last year and a half.

**ORAL**

**NO. 721 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Have Government now received the clinical services review regarding the staff composition of the Pain Clinic, and if so, can they confirm whether they have accepted the recommendations contained therein?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 761, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 722 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – EXECUTIVE TEAM**

Can the Minister for Health confirm which posts have been earmarked as Administrative Support for the new Executive Team of the Gibraltar Health Authority and whether any new posts for the team have been created?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 725 to 728, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 723 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether they have now finalised the discussions with the General Practitioners regarding their job descriptions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 687, 688 and 724 of 2005.

**NO. 724 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government state for how long they have renewed the contracts which were due to expire in January 2005, for five Medical Practitioners, and in which department of the GHA do they work?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 687 and 688**

Private practice ceased within GHA as from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2004. Therefore any discussion in respect of contracts relating to private practice is inappropriate.

**Answer to Question No. 723**

Discussions on a number of issues are taking place with the General Practitioners. Matters related to job descriptions form part of these discussions.

**Answer to Question No. 724**

Of the five Medical Practitioners whose contracts were due to expire in January 2005, three had their contracts extended to June, 2006 and two had their contracts extended to June, 2007.

All of these Practitioners are based at the Primary Care Centre.

**ORAL**

**NO. 725 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NEW POSTS**

Can Government list the officers that have been employed on temporary and non-pensionable terms in the Gibraltar Health Authority since 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2002, giving the grade, date of entry and length of contract and whether their contracts have been with the Government or with the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 722 and 726 to 728, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 726 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – TEMPORARY NON-PENSIONABLE OFFICERS**

Can Government state of the officers employed in the GHA as at 24<sup>th</sup> April 2002, listed in answer to Question No. 571 of 2002, which officers have since left the service and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 722 and 725, 727, 728, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 727 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – TEMPORARY NON-PENSIONABLE OFFICERS**

Can Government state of the officers employed in the GHA as at 24<sup>th</sup> April 2002, listed in answer to Question No. 571 of 2002, which officers have since been made permanent and pensionable, if any, and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 722, 725, 726, 728, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 728 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government confirm whether all the officers in the employment of the Gibraltar Health Authority on non-pensionable terms, as at the 24<sup>th</sup> April 2002, had Contracts of Employment with the Government, as Crown Civil Servants, and if not, list those who had contracts with the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 722, 725, 726, 727, 736, 764 and 769 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 729 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MRSA INFECTION**

Since the reply given to Question 102 of 2005, can the Government confirm whether there have been any new cases of MRSA infection affecting patients within St. Bernard's Hospital or affecting those who have been treated in health facilities abroad?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 730 of 2005.

**NO. 730 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MRSA INFECTION**

Can the Government state the names of the Health facilities abroad, in which patients who have returned to Gibraltar with MRSA Infections, were treated in?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question 729**

Between January and September 2005, 17 cases of MRSA were detected in St Bernard's Hospital, of which 7 cases were imported.

**Answer to Question 730**

The Government do not consider that it is in Gibraltar's best interest to discuss the identities of these facilities publicly. However, I am prepared to provide the information to the hon Member on a confidential basis.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 729 AND 730 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask, I do not want to press the Minister, I think it is very clear that our attitude is that if the Government take the view that something is not in Gibraltar's interest we do not press them, but can I just ask him why it might not be in Gibraltar's interest, what thinking there is behind that? I am not pressing him for the answer, just for the logic behind why it might not be in Gibraltar's interest.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I will give that information privately to the hon Member because by giving the reason I might as well divulge the initial information.

-----

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Mr Speaker, with your leave, when answering Question Nos. 729 and 730 in respect to MRSA I think the wording of the question may have given Members the wrong impression and I would like to correct that wrong impression for the sake of accuracy and for the sake of the record. My answer was that between January and September 2005, 17 cases of MRSA were detected. The key word is 'detected' here. Were detected in St Bernard's Hospital of which seven cases were imported. Although it is correct that there were 17 cases, the answer gives the impression that seven cases were imported of the 17 (*end of tape*) acquired in St Bernard's Hospital. This is bad drafting and unfortunately the drafter of the question took the word 'detected' in a broader sense to include the laboratory. So the correct answer is that 17 cases were detected, of which seven were imported, as given, five were acquired in St Bernard's Hospital, three were intrinsic cases, that is people who are carriers of the bug and have it in them when they arrive at the hospital, and another two are what were classified as undetermined. In other words, also that they had the bug before they arrived but it is not known from where it came from. So they were not imported but they were not hospital acquired. So to say again, of the 17 cases seven were imported, five were hospital acquired, three were intrinsic cases and two were from undetermined causes. My apologies to the House if I inadvertently misled anything.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Now that the Minister has clarified that perhaps we are in a position to ask him that given that the previous statistic provided by the GHA is that in the year between 1996 and 2004 there had been 18 cases detected, is it a cause of concern for the Government that in barely ten months of this year we have already had five home-grown acquired MRSA detections in obviously the new hospital, and what are the Government doing in that respect?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Actually the figure for this year is lower than it was for last year. Also, as a percentage of the population it is markedly lower than what one would expect in similar hospitals in UK and Spain, which are the two countries to which we send patients. Having said that, GHA is not complacent on this matter and there are active measures being taken on a continuing basis, and both Opposition Members and members of the public who have been visitors to the hospital recently, will have seen that we are introducing new alcohol based cleaners at the entrance to wards so that not just staff but all visitors entering and leaving wards are asked to cleanse their hands, there is a continuing monitoring process on cleansing and it is a topic that I assure Opposition Members we are very conscious of and very much trying to stay on top of it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate that, but in answer to Question No. 102 of 2005 the statistic given was 18 patients treated for MRSA acquired within St Bernard's for the period since 1996. We are talking about the period there of eight years. Now, 18 in eight years does not compare favourably to five in ten months. The Minister tells us that the figure of five in these ten months is actually lower than the figure for last year. Can he tell us of those 18, between 1996 and 2004, how many related to 2004?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, as the hon Member well knows, MRSA is a developing phenomenon. I do not have the figures in front of me, I am afraid, but I can tell him that the figure for last year was six, speaking from memory. I cannot give the breakdown for previous years but I know it has been a slightly increasing trend throughout the years. We would seem to be on the same level as we speak. As I say, the key statistic is not so much the six and the five but compared with heads of population I am advised that we are still markedly lower than similar hospitals in other countries to which we send patients.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In his first answer to my supplementary the Minister said that those who had visited the hospital will have known or will have seen what it is that the Government have done. I do not mean to sound flippant when I say that I consider myself lucky not to have had to visit the new hospital, not from a professional, political point of view but from a health point of view, and as I have not been there I am sure there are many others who have not. Could he give us an indication of what it actually is that happens now in relation to the prevention of MRSA infection?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well, one of the known ways in which MRSA is contracted is through people touching and then depositing somewhere else. So people are being asked to cleanse their hands, I think it is with a petroleum-based jelly, not with soap and water but at the entrance to the ward there are dispensers placed in which people come and throw it into their hands and clean their hands.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The answer to Question No. 102 also revealed that in one of those 18 cases, MRSA had contributed or had been found to be a contributing factor in the cause of death. Of the 17 cases detected this year, not all of which are home-grown, and of the five can the Minister tell us whether MRSA has been a contributing factor to the cause of death, or is that not information which he has available today?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would need notice of that question, that information was not provided to me. I am not aware that any deaths have been caused, much less that MRSA has been a contributing factor. I would need notice of that question.

ORAL

**NO. 731 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can the Government confirm what is the present distribution of nurses by wards and departments at St Bernard's Hospital, Europort, specifying their grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 733, 734,, 735, 737, 738, 759, 767 and 769 of 2005.

**NO. 732 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DIALYSIS TREATMENT**

Can the Government confirm whether they are already making arrangements for our nursing staff to train in providing the required Dialysis treatment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question 697**

Yes Sir, all patients who are currently receiving Dialysis treatment have been assessed and it has been established that they all require the transportation services provided by St John Ambulance.

**Answer to Question 732**

As part of GHA's policy on on-going training, a Staff Nurse has been attached to the dialysis unit to acquire and develop the skills and knowledge required. This is the second nurse to have been given the opportunity to obtain the relevant experience.

**ORAL**

**NO. 733 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ENROLLED NURSES**

Can Government confirm how many Enrolled Nurses have applied for first level training up to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 734, 735, 737, 738, 759, 767 and 768 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 734 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can the Government confirm how many contract nurses are employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of September 2005, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 733, 735, 737, 738, 759, 767 and 768 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 735 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

In view of the answer given to Question 115 of 2005, can Government confirm whether it is also the policy of the GHA to review the performance of the nursing staff who are on contract before their contracts can be renewed, and, if so, whether this is done by external assessors, as is the case with all other officers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 733, 734, 737, 738, 759, 767 and 768 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 736 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NEW POSTS**

In view of the answer given by the Government in reply to Questions 109, 116 & 117 of 2005, can they now confirm whether the staff being recruited or arriving in May, have now occupied their posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 722, 725 to 728, 764 and 769 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 737 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government confirm how many nurses there are in post as at the end of August 2005, giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 733, 734, 735, 738, 759, 767 and 768 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 738 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government state the number of non-Gibraltarian nurses in service with the Gibraltar Health Authority on the 30 September 2004 and 30 September 2005, providing a breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 733, 734, 735, 737, 759, 767 and 768 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 739 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in April, May, June, July, August and September of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 740 to 744 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 740 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ALGECIRAS CLINIC**

Can Government confirm how much has the Gibraltar Health Authority spent to date in sending patients to the Algeciras clinic for scans during the Financial Year 2005/2006 with the comparable figures for the same period last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 739 and 741 to 744 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 741 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS TO SPAIN**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as sponsored patients, and have elected to go to Spain during the months of April, May, June, July, August & September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 739, 740 and 742 to 744 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 742 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS TO UK**

Can the Government state from April to September 2005, what has been the number of patient referrals to the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 739, 740, 741 and 743 to 744 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 743 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Government state from April to September 2005 what has been the number of sponsored patients treated in the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 739 to 742 and 744 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 744 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS TO UK**

Can the Government state whether the figure of £2,658,028 in respect of the number of patient referrals to the UK during the Financial Year 2004/05 has changed since the answer given in reply to Question 93 of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 744 of 2005****Answer to Question 739**

The amount paid to clinics in Malaga for Scans in April, May, June, July, August and September of 2005 were as follows:-

April 2005	£599.51
May 2005	-
June 2005	£2,375.97
July 2005	£308.07
August 2005	£874.45
September 2005	£699.32
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4,857.32</b>

**Answer to Question 740**

The total amount spent for scans on the Algeciras Clinics is as follows:-

Up to 6 October 2005	£107,321.71
Up to 6 October 2004	£117,379.05

**Answer to Question 741**

All patients are given the choice to be treated in Spain as opposed to the UK at the time of referral when considered appropriate by the referring Consultant. 170 patients out of 619 have elected to go to Spain during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005.

**Answer to Question 742**

The number of patient referrals to the UK from April to September 2005 was 653 patients referrals. The cost identified to date is £981,159. (This figure is subject to change, as accounts have not yet been finalised).

The comparable figures for April to September 2004 was 592 patient referrals with a cost of £1,664,174.

**Answer to Question 743**

The number of sponsored patients treated in the UK from April to September 2005 was 449 patients. The cost identified to date is £981,159.00. (This figure is subject to change, as accounts have not been finalised).

The comparable figures for April to September 2004 are 461 patients with a cost of £1,664,174.00.

**Answer to Question 744**

The total payments to NHS Trusts in UK in respect of the number of patient referrals for financial year 2004/05 amounted to £2,477,272.

This figure is not subject to change.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 739 TO 744 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In reply to Question No. 743 it pleases me to note that the cost identified to date is £981,000, although it says that this figure is subject to change as accounts have not been finalised. Is it likely to increase by very much, because I note that in the comparable figures costs for almost the same number of patients was close to £1.7 million?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well, the question covers only part of the year, it covers only April to September so obviously it needs to increase to cover the full financial year.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Yes, but then the comparable figure from April to September is given as close to £1.7 million in 2004, the previous year.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This is a demand-led.....

**HON L A RANDALL:**

No it is just almost the same number of patients, although there is a caveat here that this figure is subject to change as accounts had not been finalised, the 2005 figure. In comparison to 2004 for the same period it seems that the April to September 2005 figure is rather low.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That may be so but it is not easy, we are not comparing apples with apples, 400 cases in one year could be completely different to 400 cases in another year. One gets a leukaemia patient and the costs shoot through the ceiling. It is difficult to compare without looking at specific cases.

**ORAL**

**NO. 745 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government confirm the total number of outpatient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005, keeping to the format given in answer to Question No. 66 of 2005 and additionally giving details of other departments if they are not shown there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 746 to 748 and 756 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 746 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre, including the number of out-patients being attended to by District Nurses, Occupational Therapists and Physiotherapists during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 745, 747, 748 and 756 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 747 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre Doctors during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 745, 746, 748 and 756 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 748 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GP ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 745 to 747 and 756 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 749 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St. Bernard's Hospital during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 701, 702, 703, 704 and 751 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 750 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 685 and 686**

The situation remains the same as given in answer to Question Nos. 100 and 101 of 2005.

**Answer to Question No. 750**

Three Psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted into KGV during the period April to September 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 751 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St. Bernard's Hospital during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 751 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 701**

Inpatients on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> October.

<b>Emily McIntosh</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Total</b>
	3	0 to 10	3	0 to 10	6
			4	21 to 30	4
			2	31 to 40	2
<b>Total</b>					<b>12</b>
<b>Victoria McIntosh</b>	0	41 to 50	2	41 to 50	2
	2	51 to 60	1	51 to 60	3
	2	61 to 70	6	61 to 70	8
	0	71 to 80	6	71 to 80	6
	0	81 to 90	10	81 to 90	10
	0	91 +	1	91 +	1
<b>Total</b>					<b>30</b>
<b>John McIntosh</b>	2	31 to 40	0	31 to 40	2
	2	41 to 50	0	41 to 50	2
	2	51 to 60	0	51 to 60	2
	2	61 to 70	5	61 to 70	7
	3	71 to 80	6	71 to 80	9
	4	81 to 90	2	81 to 90	6
<b>Total</b>					<b>28</b>
<b>Dudley Toomey</b>	1	31 to 40	3	31 to 40	4
	3	41 to 50	3	41 to 50	6
	3	51 to 60	2	51 to 60	5
	3	61 to 70	1	61 to 70	4
	1	71 to 80	2	71 to 80	3
	0	81 to 90	1	81 to 90	1
	0	91 +	0	91 +	0
<b>Total</b>					<b>23</b>
<b>Capt Murchison</b>	3	41 to 50	2	41 to 50	5
	3	51 to 60	1	51 to 60	4
	0	61 to 70	4	61 to 70	4
	4	71 to 80	5	71 to 80	9
	1	81 to 90	2	81 to 90	3
	0	91 +	1	91 +	1
<b>Total</b>					<b>26</b>
<b>James Giraldi</b>	1	41 to 50	0	41 to 50	1
	0	61 to 70	1	61 to 70	1
	0	71 to 80	3	71 to 80	3
<b>Total</b>					<b>5</b>

contd...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 751 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 702**

The total capacity of beds in the present hospital is 212.

The table which I will now hand the Hon Member below indicates the beds in use at the moment.

<b>Ward</b>	<b>No. of beds</b>
Emily McIntosh	22*
Rainbow	23*
Victoria McIntosh	30
John McIntosh	30
Dudley Toomey	30
Capt Murchison	30
A & E	2
Day Surgery	8
James Giraldi	6*
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>181</b>

contd...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 751 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 703**

Inpatients on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> October, 2005

APRIL 2005				MAY 2005			
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	
61-70	-	-	-	-	-	-	
71-80	1	1	2	1	1	2	
81-90	-	1	1	-	1	1	
91+	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	

JUNE 2005				JULY 2005			
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	
61-70	-	1	1	-	1	1	
71-80	1	2	3	2	2	4	
81-90	-	-	-	-	-	-	
91+	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	

AUGUST 2005				SEPTEMBER 2005			
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	
61-70	-	-	-	-	-	-	
71-80	2	2	4	2	2	4	
81-90	-	-	-	-	-	-	
91+	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	

All elderly patients require some sort of support be it physical, emotional or social.

All patients who have been officially discharged are able to be looked after.

contd...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 751 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 704**

Total number of Long Stay Elderly

TOTAL PER MONTH		MALES	FEMALES
April	23	4	19
May	54	10	44
June	38	7	31
July	36	8	28
August	37	8	29
September	32	6	26

	AGE GROUPS	MALES	FEMALES
April	65-75	1	4
	75-85	3	7
	85-95	0	6
	95+	0	2

	AGE GROUPS	MALES	FEMALES
May	65-75	3	8
	75-85	4	15
	85-95	3	18
	95+	0	3

	AGE GROUPS	MALES	FEMALES
June	65-75	3	7
	75-85	2	10
	85-95	2	14
	95+	0	0

	AGE GROUPS	MALES	FEMALES
July	65-75	2	8
	75-85	3	9
	85-95	3	10
	95+	0	1

	AGE GROUPS	MALES	FEMALES
August	65-75	2	7
	75-85	3	11
	85-95	3	10
	95+	0	1

	AGE GROUPS	MALES	FEMALES
September	65-75	3	8
	75-85	2	0
	85-95	1	8
	95+	0	1

Contd..



### **Cont'd Answer to Question 751 of 2005**

#### **Answer to Question 749**

The total number of Out-Patient attendances during the period in question were –

2005	Clinics	A&E			Physiotherapy
		Clinics	Dressings	Plasters	
April	1501	1970	504	64	614
May	1608	2053	502	78	561
June	1590	2102	580	76	625
July	1344	2170	605	61	478
August	1666	2171	654	27	642
September	1625	1997	400	56	580
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9334</b>	<b>12463</b>	<b>3245</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>3500</b>

#### **Answer to Question 751**

Total inpatient admissions

April 2005	422
May 2005	409
June 2005	407
July 2005	436
August 2005	435
September 2005	431
<b>Total</b>	<b>2540</b>

Average number of inpatients per day

April 2005	113
May 2005	108
June 2005	109
July 2005	111
August 2005	116
September 2005	108

**ORAL**

**NO. 752 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm how many non-entitled patients have been admitted to St. Bernard's Hospital during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 753 and 754 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 753 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government state whether non-entitled patients have also access to Primary Care treatment on the payment of a fee?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 752 and 754 of 2005.

**NO. 754 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether private fees for non-entitled patients accessing secondary care have now been reviewed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 752**

The number of non-entitled patients admitted into St Bernard's during the period in question is as follows:-

April:	5
May:	13
June:	20
July:	28
August:	9
September:	9

The total number of patients for the period is therefore 84.

**Answer to Question No. 753**

The GHA does not provide facilities for non-entitled patients to access treatment at the Primary Care Centre.

**Answer to Question No. 754**

The fees for non-entitled patients are in the process of being reviewed but final decisions have not yet been taken.

**ORAL**

**NO. 755 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government provide the latest waiting lists for public patients covering all specialties, giving a breakdown of each, for both out-patients and in-patients which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 757, 758 and 760 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 756 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – DUTY DENTIST**

Can Government state the times at which the duty Dentist is available at weekends and Public Holidays at the Primary Care Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 756 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 745, 746 & 748**

DEPARTMENT	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	TOTAL
AUDIOLOGY	173	196	200	214	59	279	1,121
DIETICIAN	97	106	89	88	75	95	550
CLINIC SISTER	1767	1719	1662	1508	1441	1743	9,840
SCHOOL HEALTH	357	445	448	201	212	299	1,962
SPEECH & LANGUAGE	188	196	185	155	38	242	1,004
MENTAL WELFARE	193	204	208	204	208	194	1,211
GP CLINIC	8378	8125	7718	7235	7485	8018	46,959
DERMATOLOGIST	75	No Clinic	104	No Clinic	75	No Clinic	254
DENTAL	1676	1457	1039	1123	1034	1381	7,710
CHILD WELFARE	907	831	827	724	666	841	4,796
NURSE PRACTITIONER	1125	834	1066	1162	1093	969	6,249
CRYOTHERAPY	36	28	129	124	143	182	642
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,972</b>	<b>14,141</b>	<b>13,675</b>	<b>12,738</b>	<b>12,529</b>	<b>14,243</b>	<b>82,298</b>

Orthoptist and Optometry Clinics are now held at St Bernard's Hospital.

**\*COMMUNITY**

PHYSIO	180	212	176	169	150	81	968
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY	260	230	166	153	132	97	1,038
DISTRICT	2999	3077	3644	2995	2643	1908	17,266
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,439</b>	<b>3,519</b>	<b>3,986</b>	<b>3,317</b>	<b>2,925</b>	<b>2,005</b>	<b>19,272</b>

Contd...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 756 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 747**

<b><u>DEPARTMENT</u></b>	<b><u>Apr-05</u></b>	<b><u>May-05</u></b>	<b><u>Jun-05</u></b>	<b><u>Jul-05</u></b>	<b><u>Aug-05</u></b>	<b><u>Sep-05</u></b>	<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>
HOUSE-CALLS	681	503	521	410	308	435	<b>2,858</b>

Calls received during working hours are recorded until 4.00p.m. Night calls do not form part of these statistics.

**Answer to Question 756**

The emergency dental clinic is available from 0900 – 1000 at weekends and at public holidays. Emergencies outside those hours present at the A&E and St Bernard's Hospital and, if appropriate, the duty dentist is called to attend the patient.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 745 TO 748 AND 756 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister specify who is responsible for calling out the duty dentist if thought appropriate?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Presumably he is talking about the A&E Department in St Bernard's Hospital? The answer is exactly there, if there is an emergency outside those hours the patient goes to A&E and they call the duty dentist.

**ORAL**

**NO. 757 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DENTAL DEPARTMENT**

In view of the long waiting lists at the Dental Department, which have existed now for about 4 years, can the Minister confirm what measures the Government are taking to alleviate the position?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 755, 758 and 760 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 758 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons there are presently waiting for elective surgery in each specialty?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 755, 757 and 760 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 759 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government state whether they now have a second team of nursing staff which they have said is required to be able to perform more operations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 733, 734, 735, 737, 738, 767 and 768 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 760 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF OPERATIONS**

Can Government confirm how many operations were performed in St. Bernard's at Europort, for the months of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2005, by specialties, specifying which were elective and which were emergencies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 760 of 2005****Answer to Question 755**

<b>SPECIALITY</b>	<b>OUT PATIENT CLINIC</b>	<b>SURGERY</b>
OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY	Adults 8 weeks Children 10 weeks	Adults 24 Months. Children 12 Months.
GENERAL SURGERY	16 weeks.	Up to 9 months depending on procedure.
GENERAL MEDICINE	10 to 12 weeks.	
PAEDIATRICS	5 weeks.	
OPHTHALMOLOGY	8 weeks.	Minor and other Surgery 3 weeks. Cataract Surgery 4 - 6 Weeks.
ELDEROLOGY	2 weeks.	
PAIN CLINIC	3 weeks.	
PSYCHIATRY	1 to 3 weeks.	
GYNAECOLOGY	Urgent cases 1 Day. Cases requiring attention soon 2 Weeks. Routine 8 Weeks.	1 week for urgent 3 weeks for cases requiring attention soon 12 weeks. for routine surgery
ORTHOPAEDICS	Urgent cases 1 Day. Cases requiring attention soon 2 weeks. Routine cases 52 weeks.	Waiting time for public surgery varies from 2 Weeks to Years depending on intervention.

**THERE IS NO WAITING TIME FOR EMERGENCIES****Answer to Question 757**

The successful development of the dental department and its services has resulted in raising patient expectations and therefore the demand. The dental department is evolving from what was essentially a paedontic service service to specialist dental unit and, despite the increase in dental staff and commitment, and an increase in the number of consultations to approximately 20,000 a year, the demand continues to increase.

The department is currently assessing ways of improving access to its patients through improved efficiency. The Government requested, and has obtained, a comprehensive internal report reviewing dental manpower, services and activity, facilities, IT and Equipment provision. This will be considered in next year's estimates. The aim will be to provide a sustainable plan for the alleviation of waiting times and improved access and service for all entitled patients.

**Cont'd Answer to Question 760 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 758**

**Elective Surgery Waiting Lists**

General Surgery	228
Orthopaedics	297
Ophthalmology	42
Gynaecology	50
Otorhinolaryngology	202
Orthodontics	184
Plastic Surgery	255

Contd..

**Contd to Answer 760 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 760**

Elective operations performed:

	APRIL 2005	MAY 2005	JUNE 2005	JULY 2005	AUGUST 2005	SEPTEMBER 2005
General Surgery	48	56	64	68	58	59
Gynaecology	20	20	21	31	24	17
Ophthalmology	27	28	36	11	20	23
Orthodontics	11	16	24	18	21	30
Orthopaedics	41	30	39	53	27	26
Otorhinolaryngology	15	16	15	21	20	15
Total	162	166	199	202	170	170

Emergency operations performed:

	APRIL 2005	MAY 2005	JUNE 2005	JULY 2005	AUGUST 2005	SEPTEMBER 2005
General Surgery	13	9	2	7	9	12
Gynaecology	6	6	7	3	4	16
Ophthalmology	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthodontics	-	-	2	-	-	2
Orthopaedics	-	3	1	6	7	12
Otorhinolaryngology	2	-	-	1	1	3
Total	21	18	12	17	21	45



**ORAL**

**NO. 761 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

In connection with the third review team recommendation, which relates to scheduled surgery in the specialty of gynaecology, can the Minister for Health now confirm how many patients have taken up the offer to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 721, 762, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 762 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SCHEDULED SURGERY**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether scheduled surgery has commenced for specialties other than gynaecology?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 721, 761, 765 and 766 of 2005.

**NO. 763 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STRESS MACHINE**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether authorisation has now been given by those who donated the treadmill, so that it can be upgraded and used for stress testing, and can he also confirm whether any conditions are required for the medical staff to use a stress testing machine?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The situation remains as stated in answer to Question Nos. 105 of 2005, 1539 of 2004 and 2245 of 2004. I cannot resist the temptation to say that this is another of those questions that is just being asked time and time again and the answer is the same. I will expand on it. The answer is the same because this stress unit was donated, it is incomplete, it is an exercise bicycle as opposed to a stress unit, the medical advice is against it being used other than in a facility that has an ITU next door and consultants nearby and is totally against it being used in the Primary Care Centre. In fact, if hon Members will bear with me a moment I have got a letter here from a well-known cardiologist, Dr Wyn Davis, who has visited Gibraltar for many years who says: *'I know of no setting in the UK where an exercise system is used by general practitioners, which is my understanding of the equivalent set-up of the Health Centre'*. With one or two exceptions from within the Health Services, some of which may be not altogether lacking in personal agendas, the medical opinion, the expert opinion is totally against a stress machine being used in the Primary Care Centre. The unit that was donated is, as I have said, incomplete. It lacks software, it lacks hardware, nevertheless the donors were invited by me when I took over as Minister, I do not know if it happened before my time as well, were invited to agree to it being used in St Bernard's Hospital under the proper medical supervision and circumstances and upgrade it either at their cost or at our cost, I am not sure what the situation on that is and we are still two years down the line waiting for an answer to that request. Until such time as they agree or disagree, unfortunately the exercise bicycle as I call it will remain where it is unused, and that will remain the answer to this question despite the number of times that it is asked. The ball is not in the court of the GHA.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 763 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask whether the Minister might agree to follow up with his pursuit of this with the donors just in case his letter or his request has fallen between two stools, whoever it is that the donor is, and perhaps in that way we might have a different answer to the question which I have no doubt will be put again at the next session of the House?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Which no doubt will get the same answer, that the situation has not changed. I have taken up the matter again and I do not want to make any provocative statements but there seems to be an ingrained belief in those who donated it that it has to be used in the Primary Care Centre or nothing else, and that is the impasse. I will reassure the hon Member, if and when I meet the donors again officially, I will take up the matter again.

ORAL

**NO. 764 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SALARY SCALES**

Can Government provide the Salary Scale of each grade of employee working in the GHA indicating those grades which have a pay review pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 689 to 691, 722, 725 to 728, 736 and 769 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 765 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Have any further payments been made to the NHS Modernisation Agency since the answer given to Question 128 of 2005, and if so, how much and when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 721, 761, 762 and 766 of 2005.

**NO. 766 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – LABORATORY SERVICE**

Has the Clinical Report on Laboratory Services now been presented to the Government, and if so, what are its conclusions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Questions 715, 716 and 765**

No payments have been made to the NHS Modernisation Agency since the answer given to Question No. 128 of 2005.

The total expenditure is not expected to exceed £1.6 million.

**Answer to Question 717**

The consultation process for the different workstreams has been very extensive and the Government and the GHA have endeavoured to involve as many members of staff as has been possible in the development of these proposals making this a very transparent and open process.

The staff have been involved at three stages either individually or as part of working groups. First in the formulation of the initial documentation. Secondly, in the development of all proposals and thirdly before final consideration by the Government of Gibraltar.

Where the Government have felt that public participation was desirable, for example in the complaints process, external organisations and individuals have been consulted. These have included the unions, the Ombudsman, patient user groups and the general public.

The recommendations accepted by the Government have now been incorporated into the GHA's strategic plan which was outlined during my budget speech. Executive responsibility has been assigned to individual executive team members for different elements of the Health Care Development Team recommendations.

**Answer to Questions 718, 719, 721 and 766**

The GHA has received a report on Workstream No. 18 in relation to clinical services within the GHA. No specific review was undertaken of the pain clinic. The recommendations accepted by the Government are being incorporated into the GHA strategic plan.

**Answer to Questions 761 and 762**

The pilot initiative for scheduling in gynaecology is proceeding as outlined in answer to Question No. 2241 of 2004.

A total of 133 patients were scheduled for surgery in the period April to September 2005, that is surgery in gynaecology. Scheduling in other specialities has not started.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 715 TO 719, 721, 761, 762, 765 AND 766  
OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Perhaps I have missed it but what was the answer on the clinical report on laboratory services?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That it has been received, together with all the other reports, as part of the report on Workstream No. 18. Workstream No. 18 provided the report on the Modernisation Agency or the Health Care Development Team in respect of all clinical services.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the Minister is not able to answer the second part of the question which is, what are the conclusions in respect of the laboratory services then?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This is a very wide-ranging report covering 12 different clinical services, like all the other details it is not possible to identify in an answer like this individual recommendations. That is notwithstanding the fact that in terms like clinical services, the Government have not published and do not intend to publish publicly the results of Workstream No. 18.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but was there not a particular problem in relation to the laboratory services which surfaced at the time, which was in the public domain and which presumably was being looked into and addressed?



**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure what particular problem the hon Member is referring to.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Certainly there was something that I think it was the pathologist first raised and then withdrew, I certainly remember that particular incident.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That had nothing to do with the workstreams. If I remember rightly, this was a concern that the pathologist expressed in relation to staffing levels and to equipment levels, both of which I tackled publicly at the time and the Government did so by press release, and I am not sure whether the pathologist withdrew it or made a new statement or just changed his mind. The issues that the hon Member is referring to were not part of the clinical review, this was something that the pathologist raised at the time and the issues were addressed by the GHA on their own merits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then the report that has dealt with the laboratory services has not looked at manning levels, and has not looked at procedures and has not looked at whether the equipment was okay, none of it has been looked at?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The reports on all the clinical services have looked at all aspects of the clinical services, including where relevant, manning levels, equipment levels, it is a wide-ranging review of all the clinical services.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

They have not come to a conclusion as to whether they were adequate and needed improving because that was one of the issues, whether the resources that the laboratory had were sufficient? There have been a number of questions in the past about this and we were always being told it was being looked into.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Again on my feet and without the reports here I cannot answer that question, but in any case as I have said, the implications are that the Government will not be publishing that particular workstream report.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister not agree with me that there is a vast difference between publishing a report in full and giving an indication of the conclusion as to whether the conclusion is that a particular department needs more resources or more money and manpower, or that it does not? I am not asking for anything more explicit than that.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The question was had the clinical report been presented to the Government and what were its conclusions. I have said, yes it has been presented to the Government, no the Government do not intend to make the conclusions public.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am asking was one of the conclusions, without asking for all of them to be made public, expressing a view on the insufficiency of resources which has previously been a matter in the public domain before this study took place? I would have thought that if there was a debate as to whether the laboratory was sufficiently resourced, and one is going to get people that one is going to pay to come and take a look at the laboratory, I would have thought that one would expect them at the very least to express a view on that, which we are asking the Government to share with us if such a view has been expressed.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

As I have already said, at this moment in time I cannot say whether equipment was looked at in this clinical review but I would expect it to have been looked at because this is what the clinical review is all about, but I cannot say it because I have not got the report here and I have not checked that specifically in preparing the answer to this question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask about the previous question where the Minister said the total cost was £1.6 million? This £1.6 million is paid to the agency by the Health Authority or by the Government?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, let us clarify two issues here. Is the hon Member distinguishing on who actually wrote the cheque, is that what he is asking me to do?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am asking who the cheque was made to and who it was made by, I am asking both those things.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I understand. Let us leave who it was made to for a moment because that is relevant. I think the process was that initially the payments were being made by the GHA and in some cases payments continue to be made by the GHA on behalf of the Government. As at one stage the Treasury or the system was changed and at one stage the Treasury took over the account and from that point on, which I cannot identify but within the last year or so, at one point the Treasury started making the payments. So, to the question 'who wrote the cheque?' the answer is both but it is a technicality because obviously the GHA when they were writing cheques were writing them on behalf of the Government. I think it is a technicality in that the GHA had the account initially and then the account, because it was a Government-commissioned review, passed to the Treasury. That is my memory of it. Who the cheques were made to is more relevant because that £1.6 million is the total cost and that includes flights and hotels and issues like that, so not all of it would have been paid to the agency. The fees of the agency would have been paid to them and other incidental expenses would have been paid to the parties concerned, like the airlines and hotels.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it is not that there was a contract for the total amount with the agency and then the agency met its own expenses? Is the Minister in a position to say how much was the agency's part?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, and in order to pre-empt a possible question in the future, I asked the same question myself because it seemed a fairly obvious supplementary, and I was told it was going to be difficult to extricate.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is that in the same box that everything else is in?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, it is not in the same box but it does mean going back and looking at every single payment and separating the breakdown of the payment. Again, technically possible but I asked for it to have the supplementary information here with me and I was told it was not an easy exercise but if the hon Member is content with blanket figures it might be possible, if he is not interested in getting it itemised down to single pounds.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask, are the payments to individuals who have been working in Gibraltar included in that and are they made by the agency to the individuals in terms of salaries or fees or whatever, or is that separate?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Does the hon Member by 'individuals' mean members of the Health Care Development Team who were working here? If he does, in that sense his questions one or two back was correct in that the Government contracted the agency to provide the service and the agency decided or had pre-planned who it was going to send. So the Government did not pay one individual or another individual that formed part of the Review Team, there was a contract fee overall and the agency provided its resources as and when it needed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the people who have been working here sent out by the agency were paid by the agency and not directly by the Government then?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is correct. Paid by the agency presumably from the fees paid under the contract.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe that when I asked this question some time ago there was some doubt as to whether the amount received by the individuals was taxable. I am fairly sure that I asked that question and that I did not get a straight answer, can the Minister now give me a straight answer?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the Minister could not give a straight answer then and he cannot give a straight answer now, because it does not come under my responsibility. We pay the agency and it is up to the Treasury and others to decide whether it is taxable or not taxable. I recollect the discussion and I think I must have said something pretty similar at the time and the answer remains the same, I do not know whether it is taxable or not taxable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister accept that it is they who choose who should answer the questions, we put the questions to the Government and not to individual Ministers? I would have thought that given his previous concern about the amount of money that it is going to cost the Health Authority to buy property for rental in the open market as opposed to buying it in the restricted market, whether people working in Gibraltar in the Health Authority in a Government agency are actually complying with their requirements, I would have not thought it was reasonable. If the Government have got as a matter of policy which they announce periodically pursuing those who do not comply with their obligations to hand over PAYE and Social Insurance and all the rest, would the Minister not agree that the Health Authority ought to be setting a good example to make sure that the people that are working on its pad at public expense are in fact paying their taxes and levies due?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

With the greatest of respect to the hon Member, he has not only changed the goal posts but he has mixed his circumstances and has changed the question completely. Firstly he says that if the Opposition side decide to ask the questions it is up to the Government to decide to answer it and the person who answers it should know what he is talking about, implying that I do not, which is true in this case I do not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

With all due respect, I am not saying the Minister ought to be able to all I am saying is that since the question is addressed to the Government there is nothing to prevent another member of the Government that may be able to throw light volunteering.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is precisely why I said changing the goal posts. There is not a question on this subject addressed to the Government. The question is on the amount of fees to the agency. The question of tax, which is what is being raised now, is a memory that the hon Member has just had of a previous question. If the hon Member had asked the question on tax then it would have been addressed by someone in Government who was better qualified and better prepared to answer it. No such question has been raised, it has been raised in supplementaries and the short answer is that we need notice of the question on tax.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister say how many, if any, of the recommendations contained in the report have not been accepted by Government and will therefore not be incorporated?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I appreciate the hon Member is standing in for the Opposition Member for Health and therefore may not be entirely familiar with this, although I have to say that his colleague does not seem to be totally familiar with it either. Work that has been done by the Health Care Development Team is extremely extensive, it is not a straightforward report commissioned to look at this room and advise on how to make it look better, and then the recommendations would say knock it down and build it again or repaint it, or wallpaper it again, or re-roof it and whatever and they would be specific. Here we are talking about 20 different workstreams, each workstream covers one particular area or sector of the work of our Health Services, each workstream is many pages long sometimes running into hundreds of pages, many of them are not reports in the sense of having a beginning, a middle and an end and a list of recommendations at the end. Many of them are narrative and many of them are saying, 'maybe this could be done better or maybe this should be done', what I am trying to say is that it is not possible, without a massive exercise, to go through every single one and try to extract and say firstly what is the recommendation and secondly which ones have been accepted by the Government, which ones have not, which ones have been done, which ones are being done, which ones have been rejected, it is being done on the basis of report by report, the Government have

accepted the report and made some rejections, not many but there have been some rejections, and the GHA has been charged with implementing it. It has taken over two years if I remember rightly, in September 2003 the diagnostic report was published and the Election was in November 2003. Prior to September 2003 they had already been working on it for another year or year and a half so we are looking at work that has gone on over an extended period of time running into years, we are talking about two or three years plus, hon Members cannot expect the Government to be able to say 'yes everything has been done', it is an on-going process. The results of that work which took three years to do will take many months to implement, part of it is still being analysed. It is one thing to accept the recommendation and one thing to say re-roof the ceiling here, another thing is to then come and actually do it. Similarly, with some of these recommendations which are complex and which need to be assessed, need to be valued, need to be costed, which then probably got moved forward into the following financial year it is not an easy task and it is not an easy task trying to summarise it in answer to a question. I hope I have given the small details of the explanation and I hope the hon Member's colleague is listening to it on radio that that explanation will serve to put it into context.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I asked the question because I took note here where the Minister said that recommendations accepted by Government are being incorporated. That to me implied that perhaps there were recommendations that had not been accepted and were therefore not being incorporated. Also if my memory serves me right, in previous exchanges of supplementaries with my Colleague the Hon Marie Montegriffo, I seem to recall that the Minister himself said that some of the recommendations may not be accepted by Government and would not be incorporated. Even by the answer it seems to imply that there are recommendations which the Government have decided not to implement.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is correct. They are in the minority and it is also true to say that some of the recommendations that had been accepted cannot all be implemented at the same time. Some have been implemented immediately, like we always come to the Complaints process which was one of the first ones, but also because it is one that is in the public eye all the time but then there are other recommendations of a minor nature that are on-going into the future that will take longer to implement.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I appreciate what the Minister has just said, the purpose of the question was to determine whether any of the recommendations have just been turned down, not accepted or not being implemented, I can understand recommendations will take time to implement, if they have been accepted they will be implemented in the future, it is on-going there are delays but the purpose of the question is have any recommendations been turned down altogether and said 'this we have are not incorporating'?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Can I take the hon Member back to what I was saying at the beginning? The short answer to the question is yes but if he then asks me which ones, on my feet it is difficult because there are so many of them and some of them will have been accepted and some not.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Fine, I will ask questions to that effect at the next meeting of the House.

**ORAL**

**NO. 767 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – ENROLLED NURSES**

Has there now been a 2005 Enrolled Nurses Training Intake, and if so, have the students been guaranteed employment in the GHA on the successful completion of their training?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 731, 733, 734, 735, 737, 738, 759 and 768 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 768 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – STAFF NURSE TRAINING**

Can Government provide a breakdown by Nationality of the last two intakes of students undertaking Staff Nurse Training?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule which I hand over to him.

**Answer to Question 768 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 731**

**Dudley Toomey Ward**

Sister	1
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	9
Enrolled Nurses	6

**Captain Murchison Ward**

Sister	1
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	7
Enrolled Nurses	7

**Maternity Ward**

Sisters	2
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Midwives	12

**Rainbow Ward**

Sister	1
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	8
Enrolled Nurses	3
Senior Enrolled Nurse	1
Auxillary Nurse	1

**A & E Department**

Sister	1
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	12
Enrolled Nurses	6

**Clinics**

Staff Nurse	1
Senior Enrolled Nurse	1
Enrolled Nurses	9

**Blood Department**

Staff Nurses	2
--------------	---

Contd..

**Cont'd Answer to Question 768 of 2005**

**Infection Control Dept**

Charge Nurse	1
--------------	---

**Palliative Care**

Sister	1
--------	---

**Eye Dept**

Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	2

**John Ward**

Charge Nurses	2
Staff Nurses	9
Enrolled Nurses	8

**Victoria Ward**

Sisters	4
Staff Nurses	6
Enrolled Nurses	7

**Intensive Care Unit**

Sisters	1
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	20
Enrolled Nurses	5

**Operating Theatres**

Sister	1
Charge Nurse	1
Staff Nurses	9
Enrolled Nurses	1

**Answer to Question 733**

Applied	Withdrew	Interviewed	Selected
10	1	9	6

contd....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 768 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 734**

The following is a breakdown within nursing specialities of the contract nurses employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of September 2005:

Director of Nursing & Patient Services	1
Education Development Officer	1
Nurse Lecturer	1
Nurse Practitioners	2
Charge Nurses	2
Staff Nurses	24
Staff Nurses (part-time)	1
Registered Sick Children's Nurses	4
Registered Mental Nurses	4
Theatre Nurses	2
Staff Midwives	7
Operating Department Practitioners	6
Enrolled Nurses	4

**Answer to Question 735**

It is now the policy of the Gibraltar Health Authority to review the performance and development needs of all nursing staff on a regular basis using internal resources.

Contd....

Contd to Answer 768 of 2005

Answer to Question 737

The following is a breakdown by grade of nurses in post as at the end of August 2005:

<b>Director of Nursing &amp; Patient Services</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Deputy Director of Nursing Services</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Clinical Nurse Managers</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Education Development Officer</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Senior Nurse Tutor</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Nurse Lecturer</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Nurse Practitioners</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Charge Nurses</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Staff Nurses</b>	
107 Full-timers	}
9 Part-timers (4.5 Full-time equivalents)	
<b>Midwives</b>	
7 Full-timers	
2 Part-timers (1 Full-time equivalent)	<b>119.5</b>
<b>Senior Enrolled Nurses</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Enrolled Nurses</b>	
<b>81 Full-timers</b>	
14 Part-timers (7 Full-time equivalents)	<b>88</b>
<b>Nursing Auxiliaries</b>	
9 Full-timers	}
1 Part-timer (0.5 Full-time equivalent)	
<b>Nursing Assistants</b>	
80 Full-timers	
10 Part-timers (5 Full-time equivalent)	<b>97.5</b>
4 (28 hours) (3 Full-time equivalent)	

Contd..

**Contd to Answer 768 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 738**

On 30 September 2004 there were a total of 54 non-Gibraltar nurses, the breakdown of these are as follows:

38 British  
12 Spanish  
1 Polish  
1 Irish  
1 German  
1 Malaysian

On 30 September 2005 there were a total of 68 non-Gibraltar nurses, the breakdown of these are as follows:

46 British  
18 Spanish  
1 Polish  
1 Irish  
1 German  
1 Malaysian

**Answer to Question 768**

	<u>Gibraltar</u>	<u>British</u>	<u>American</u>	<u>Canadian</u>
2002 Intake	8	2	1	1
2004 Intake	6	3	1	

**Answer to Question 759**

An additional 6 nurses have been recruited to meet current surgical Human Resource requirements.

**Answer to Question 767**

Following an analysis of short-term enrolled nursing requirements, it was decided to postpone the 2005 Enrolled Nurse training intake pending completion of an internal workforce planning report that will be used as a basis for determining all future nurse training requirements, including Enrolled Nurses.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 731, 733, 734, 735, 737, 738, 759, 767  
AND 768 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the question on the guaranteed employment also on the schedule? Question No. 767, I asked this question in the last meeting of the House and the Minister said he was not in a position to answer me because there had not been an intake yet. That is why it is here.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I shall quote the answer because I remember it vaguely. The answer that I have given him in the schedule is "following an analysis of short-term enrolled nursing requirements, it was decided to postpone the 2005 enrolled nurse training intake pending completion of an internal workforce planning report that will be used as a basis for determining future nurse training requirements, including those of enrolled nurses." So the question of guarantees still remains hypothetical.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, there has not been an intake then in 2005 and it does not look as if there is going to be one now in 2005? Presumably, if it is resumed it will be in 2006. Can I ask the Minister? In this kind of training is there any particular reason why it has to be at a particular time of the year like with other things that are linked to exams where the academic year starts after the summer, or can it be started in any given month?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not aware of any reason why it has to be at any particular moment in time but the hon Member has interpreted my answer correctly. Although an intake had been planned for September, because of the various changes that are taking place within the GHA it was assessed that our complement of enrolled nurses was sufficient with what we had, and because we are planning further changes and looking at the overall picture it was decided to postpone the intake with a view to having a size of intake in line with requirements. Although the Government cannot undertake to guarantee employment to people that they give training to, and this is Government wide and not just the GHA, from a GHA point of view because one trains an enrolled nurse they cannot really go and get employed by the Education Department for example, the objective of the GHA would be to have a course with the right number of students to fill the right number of vacancies expected to arise at the end of the course, and because we cannot determine those vacancies that is why we have postponed it. I cannot here now say that the Government will guarantee employment, I can say that the GHA and the Government will seek to train the right number of nurses so that they can be employed at the end of the course.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Minister not agree that there would be little point in investing money in training people for jobs that we do not need them for? In this particular case where it is not a question of sending them to study in the UK and then they are free to work anywhere. Is it not the case that in-house training of enrolled nurses has always been in the knowledge that they would be needed when they completed the training?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, it is implicit of what I have said earlier that I accept that principle. One cannot accept the principle completely because theoretically an enrolled nurse could then go and find employment away from Gibraltar. So if one were to strictly apply that criteria then we would never give a scholarship to someone to study nuclear physics for example, because he cannot come back to Gibraltar to work it, but that would be restricting the ability of that particular student. In the cases of nurses, it is more incestuous as it were because there is only a certain employer who can employ those nurses, but theoretically one could have a situation where there is a particular individual who wants to do a particular course in nursing..... supposing there were no vacancies projected in nursing for the next two years and if no training were done it would restrict that individual. I think that in the case of nursing it would be debateable whether it is the correct use of public funds to create a training course if vacancies are not identified. So it is debateable either way.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well no, this is not part of the Government's facilities for Education and Training which exist. If the Government are saying they are going to have training courses for nurses period like they train carpenters or they train electricians, or they send people to the UK to be student teachers, then that is a different issue. The Health Service is training people for its own needs surely and therefore the same considerations do not apply.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think essentially we are both saying the same thing, we are both agreeing in principle. I was just trying to add to the philosophical debate but I think we should stick to, as the hon Member said earlier, that the GHA will seek to have training courses only for identified vacancies, as far as it is possible to crystal ball gaze two years ahead.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just as a matter of interest, who accredits the enrolled nurse? I believe the Minister for Health before used to say that they had contact with the University of Durham, or is it Sheffield Hallam?



**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No it is not Sheffield Hallam it is the other Sheffield University. It has been up to now. There may be changes on that in the future because there have been internal changes within Sheffield University itself and I think GHA are about to go out to tender for an association into the future. So it continue to be Sheffield, it could become Sheffield Hallam to which the present School of Nursing in Sheffield is moving into, or it could be another successful tenderer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Could I simply ask one question in relation to this? Was there a public statement to the effect that the process of training had stopped for the year 2005?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would not have thought so because the course had not been announced as such and applications had not been invited. If that had happened then maybe we would have announced its cancellation but the course has just been postponed in time rather than cancelled. So I cannot remember any public announcement.

-----

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I wonder if I may be permitted to put a supplementary question on No. 768 because it takes a bit of time to read all of it? In the intakes that took place for Staff Nurses, is there in those cases a guarantee of employment or not as opposed to the enrolled nurses which we already have received an answer on?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

There has been a guarantee of employment in that all the nurses who were on the course have been employed. De facto all have been employed and they graduated a couple of weeks ago.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am talking about Question No. 768 where we had a breakdown by nationality of the 2002 intake which presumably finished three years later in 2005. So all of those have now completed their training from 2002 and have been taken on in employment, is that the case?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

All nurses who finished the course two or three weeks ago have been, all who finished successfully because some dropped by the wayside, all who successfully

finished the course and qualified and graduated two or three years ago have been employed into the GHA.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask in terms of the nationality breakdown, given that we have got American and Canadian nationals being trained by the Health Authority as Staff Nurses, is it not the case that these non-EU nationals require work permits and my understanding is that the Staff Nurses are not treated as employees but are given actual bursaries to undertake the studies for three years? So how does it work with non-EU nationals that have been recruited?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am subject to correction on this answer, but my understanding is that it works exactly the same as EU nationals. If they have worked with us before they lose their salary or their wages and they get a bursary instead and I do not know whether they can come in straight into the course, they work on the basis of a bursary which was initially or used to be paid by the Education Department but as from this year is being paid or funds are being controlled by the GHA. My understanding, subject to correction, is that there is no difference in as much as the payment during the training period. At least if there is it has not come to my notice.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not think the Gibraltarians would be too pleased to see that the others are getting paid more than they are so it was bound to be the same. My question is, given that these nationalities that are non-EU require work permits in Gibraltar, it seems peculiar to me that we should be providing training to non-EU nationals who at the end of the day do not even need to work for us and we have been training them. I can understand that it could be argued that there may be some requirement under EU law that we give the same opportunities to nationals of other Member States in applying for courses and training.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

There is obviously a requirement for equal opportunities to other Member States. I think I would be right in saying that in the question of nursing supply is always less than demand and therefore, as appears to have happened here, non-EU nationals have entered the course. I would have thought that if the course had been over-subscribed by EU nationals then there would be no xxxxx there, but I am subject to correction in this answer.

**NO. 769 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – FRONTIER WORKERS**

Can Government state how many frontier workers were employed in the Gibraltar Health Authority as at October 2004 and give a breakdown by sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 689**

I can confirm that a new Radiologist took up his post on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005 and that CT Scan services in St Bernard's Hospital will commence shortly. The recruitment of a second Radiologist is already under way.

**Answer to Question No. 690**

Shortly after my contribution at the last budget session of this House the second orthopaedic surgeon who had been selected informed us that he was declining our offer of appointment for reasons of a personal nature which arose after the offer had been made. The post was immediately re-advertised and I can confirm that a second Orthopaedic Surgeon has been selected and, subject to acceptance of contract offer, will commence his duties in 2006.

However, until the second orthopaedic surgeon takes up his post one of the non-consultant hospital doctors has been appointed to provide some of the services that would normally be provided by an orthopaedic surgeon.

**Answer to Question No. 691**

The post of the Catering Director was advertised internally within the Civil Service in the Bulletin of Circulars and externally in the local press. No application from within the Civil Service was received. Five external applications were received and one of these applicants was appointed. The salary scale for the post of Catering Director is as follows:

£25,434; £26,447; £27,505; £28,612 and £29,753 per annum.

**Answer to Question No. 722**

Three Personal Secretary posts have been created in order to support the new Executive Team.

**Answer to Question Nos. 725, 726, 727 and 728**

The information which goes back several years requested by the hon Member in Question Nos. 725 and 728 of 2005 is not available electronically. While theoretically it would be possible to provide the information requested, it would involve a disproportionate amount of administrative effort to produce these statistics.

**Answer to Question No. 736**

All members of staff listed in answer to Question Nos. 109, 116 and 117 of 2005 as being recruited or arriving in May are now in post with the exception of the Orthopaedic Surgeon, an Anaesthetist, the Building Maintenance Officer and some part-time Domestics.

**Answer to Question Nos. 764 and 769**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member in Question Nos. 764 and 769 of 2005 is contained in the schedule that I hand over.

**Answer to Question 769 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 764**

<u>GRADE</u>	<u>SALARY SCALE</u>
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	11,220 to 17,072
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER	13,336 to 20,293
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (p/t)	13,336 to 20,293
ASSOCIATE SPECIALIST	73,748 to 90,998*
BASIC GRADE PHARMACIST	21,791 to 24,221
CATERING DIRECTOR	25,434 to 29,753
CHIEF EXECUTIVE	108,544
CHIEF SPEECH & LANGUAGE THERAPIST	38,389 to 41,525
CLINICAL NURSE MANAGER	26,685 to 32,001
CLINICAL NURSE SPECIALIST	20,246 to 25,283
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST	52,540
CONSULTANT	73,750 to 91,000*
CONSULTANT (Distinction B Award)	96,035*
DENTAL OFFICER	30,351 to 48,077
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERV	38,744
DIETITIAN SNR I	23,295 to 27,806
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, IMT, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND	
PS TO THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH	71,680
DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES	60,758*
DIRECTOR OF NURSING & PATIENT SERV	66,758*
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL SERVICES AND	
DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE	71,680
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH	76,367*
DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERV & WORKS	39,331
ENROLLED NURSE	13,918 to 18,253
EXECUTIVE OFFICER	17,072 to 25,317
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	61,891*
GHA CLERK	13,336 to 20,293
H.P.T.O.	21,320 to 31,627
HEAD PHARMACIST	41,265 to 43,499
HEALTH PROMOTION OFFICER	25,434 to 29,753
HIGHER EXECUTIVE OFFICER	21,320 to 30,893
HOSPITAL ATTENDANTS	16,029 to 22,105
HOSPITAL OPTOMETRIST	28,052 to 30,341
IT USER SUPPORT ASSISTANT	13,336 to 20,293
IT USER SUPPORT OFFICER	20,974 to 29,219
JUNIOR MEDICAL LAB & SCIENTIFIC OFFICER	10,546 to 14,224
MEDICAL LAB & SCIENTIFIC OFFICER	16,849 to 20,500
MEDICAL LIBRARIAN	20,903 to 22,608
MEDICAL SECRETARY	13,336 to 20,800
MENTAL WELFARE OFFICER	19,686 to 23,280
NURSE ASSISTANT	11,485 to 13,918
NURSE AUXILIARY	11,485 to 14,614

contd....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 769 of 2005**  
**Contd Answer to Question 764**

NURSE PRACTITIONER	26,685 to 31,015
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST – HEAD	28,962 to 32,001
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST – SNR I	23,295 to 27,806
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST – SNR II	19,615 to 24,972
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY HELPER	10,764 to 12,927
OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONER	15,575 to 19,709
ORTHOPTIST – SNR I	23,295 to 27,806
PATIENT COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR	21,320 to 30,893
P & GS 'C'	18,812 to 25,996
P.T.O	17,072 to 26,626
PERSONAL SECRETARY	13,336 to 20,800
PHYSIOTHERAPY HELPER	10,764 to 12,927
PHYSIOTHERAPIST – SNR I	23,295 to 27,806
PHYSIOTHERAPIST – SNR II	19,615 to 24,972
RADIOGRAPHER – SNR I	23,295 to 27,806
RADIOGRAPHER – SNR II	19,615 to 24,972
RADIOGRAPHER HELPER	10,764 to 12,927
RECEPTIONIST/HELPDESK OPERATOR	12,156 to 13,917
S.P.T.O.	26,626 to 39,331
SENIOR DENTAL OFFICER (DISC)	58,718 to 59,498
SENIOR DENTAL OFFICER	43,777 to 57,937
SENIOR ENROLLED NURSE	15,966 to 21,137
SENIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICER	26,626 to 37,864
NON CONSULTANT HOSPITAL DOCTOR	23,849 to 33,443*
S.M.L.S.O.	21,314 to 34,129
SENIOR MENTAL WELFARE OFFICER	23,967 to 25,372
SENIOR OFFICER	36,705 to 57,330
SENIOR TUTOR	35,962
SISTER/CHARGE NURSE	23,890 to 29,072
SPECIALIST DIETITIAN	26,674 to 29,453
SPEECH & LANGUAGE THERAPIST	29,171 to 31,555
STAFF MIDWIFE	20,246 to 25,283
STAFF NURSE	17,082 to 22,964
STORES ASSISTANT	13,670
STORES OFFICER GRADE D	16,214 to 23,615
SUPPORT GRADE BAND II	11,910 to 16,767
SUPERINTENDENT PHYSIOTHERAPIST	28,962 to 32,001
SUPERINTENDENT RADIOGRAPHER	28,962 to 32,001
T.G.1	16,214 to 23,615
TECHNICAL INSTRUCTOR GRADE III	13,136 to 14,729
TSSU/CSSD MANAGER	17,082 to 22,964
TSSU/CSSD TECHNICIAN (PTH)	17,082 to 22,964
TSSU/CSSD TECHNICIAN	11,485 to 13,918
TUTOR	32,461 to 34,725
TYPIST	11,220 to 17,072
WARD PHARMACIST	24,527 to 30,383
WARD CLERK	13,336 to 20,293

**\* PAY REVIEW PENDING**

contd...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 769 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 769**

As at October 2004 there were a total of 20 frontier workers employed in the Gibraltar Health Authority, the breakdown of these is as follows:

<b>British Male</b>	<b>Spanish Male</b>	<b>British Female</b>	<b>Spanish Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
2	5	6	7	20

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 689, 690, 691, 722, 725 TO 728, 736, 764  
AND 769 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact, the Minister is saying that they have no way of knowing without doing it manually whether of the 91 contract officers that were given in answer to the question in 2002 whether they were employed by the Health Authority or employed by the Government?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The information that I was provided when the questions were placed was that most of this information was historical and in order to provide a full answer to all the questions we would need to open up the archives and look into records, and whereas it might be possible to provide answers to those people who are currently in post, because their files are current, in many cases the files are now stored away and they need to be found, identified and research carried out and I was told that the work involved could take up to about two weeks. However, if there are specific questions on any specific individual then it would be obviously easier to answer but it would take a long time to provide the answer to the questions as phrased.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I remind the Minister that in answer to a previous Question there was quite a lengthy series of exchanges as to whether in fact people were being employed by the Health Authority with contracts issued by the Health Authority, we were talking about contract people who were not permanent and pensionable, and in fact it was not clear whether the policy, I think it was left then, that although the power had always existed in the Ordinance from 1987 for the Health Authority to employ people directly the answers that I had to my questions at the time was that the Ministers were not 100 per cent sure whether in fact any or all or none were in fact directly employed. What is the position today? I would have thought that one would know at the very least whether as a matter of policy the Health Authority actually engages people itself or does not.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The answer to that is simple, yes, by far the majority of the employees of the Health Authority are employed by the Government on behalf of the Health Authority. I think in fact if I am not mistaken this is the subject of another question or there is an answer to it in another question that provides this information but by far the majority are employed by the Government on behalf of the GHA and are Civil Servants but the GHA does employ in its own right contract officers depending on the circumstances. For example, the Catering Director who we have just mentioned has been employed by the GHA.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the applications were advertised internally in the Government what was the position then? Would somebody applying from within the Government then would have had to leave the Government and join the GHA, or is it that because the applicant was recruited from outside that he is employed by the Health Authority?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If we are talking about the Catering Director, yes. In the case of the Catering Manager or Director if the application from someone within the Service had been successful he would have retained his position as a Civil Servant and taken up the post. As there were no applications internally then the job was given to someone from outside and that was on contract to the GHA.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the 91 that we were given on the list on that date the Minister cannot in fact confirm that they were all, I mean it is not that all contract officers are automatically are employees of the Health Authority then?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure of the answer to that question, we may be back in the position that we were in 2002. Both are happening, contract officers generally are by the GHA. I hesitate to say that all by the GHA without checking that information. I cannot say that on my feet without having checked the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would it be correct to assume that people who are contract officers with the GHA as opposed to contract officers with the Government are not subject to things like General Orders and Colonial Regulations and so forth, which are Civil Service conditions of employment?

**HON LT-COL E BRITTO:**

No I do not think that is correct, I think that as part of the contract they would be subject to all the same conditions. I think we would write into the contracts that they are subject to General Orders. This is the same in the Electricity Authority and in various other Authorities.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, so although these are Civil Service conditions of employment they are applied in the Health Authority and in the other Agencies to non-Civil Servants?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The conditions are applied according to the terms of the contract. I cannot give the hon Member a blanket answer, if he asks a specific question on a specific post I can give him an answer but not as generally as he is phrasing the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there then not a Government policy? Presumably the Government have got a policy of employing people in the Gibraltar Health Authority as employees of the Health Authority as opposed to being employees of the Gibraltar Government, they must also have a policy of whether Gibraltar Health Authority employees are still subject to General Orders and Colonial Regulations as if they were Civil Servants, notwithstanding the fact that they are not Civil Servants? It cannot be that one may apply to one individual and not to the next applicant, surely there must be a Government policy on these things otherwise one would be handing out discriminatory treatment for people doing equal jobs. I find that difficult to understand frankly.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It brings me back to the position of 2002, I would need notice of that question to be able to give an exact answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not even possible then, for example, in the first of these questions which is Question No. 725, to provide information as to how many are still in post and how many have left the Service and things like that? I think there was a series of supplementaries relating in Question No. 726 asking about which officers have left the Service and on which date, so the Government are not able to tell us of the officers that they gave us who were on contract who is no longer there?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That answer would seem to be easier to give. The answer I have given is in relation to all four questions, Question Nos. 725, 726 and I think Nos. 727 and 728 if I am not mistaken. Those four questions are very wide-ranging and it would need examining, all those 91 records but as I said at the beginning those that are current are easier to answer, those that are not current then we would have to go back and find out what happened at the time. It is the digging into the archives that would take time. If the hon Member would like to narrow down the question then within the House or outside the House I can attempt to give him an answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would have thought that if the Question of which we have given notice is, 'can Government state of the officers employed in the GHA on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2002 listed in answer to Question No. 571, which have left the service and on which date?' well, there were 91 names on that list, there were eight cooks, I would have thought simply

by looking into the kitchen one would know whether there were still eight there or only seven without having to delve into all the closed records. So it would appear to me, with all due respect to the Minister, that if it was not possible to give a full answer to this question at least some answers could have been given, simply to say it would take a long time I would have thought it would not be all that difficult to establish who has left and who is still there because presumably most of them are still there.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That would seem a logical position.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Minister not agree that perhaps if we repeat the question at a future date, given that they have got until now and the next Question Time, it may be possible to produce some answers?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well, I would encourage the hon Member to narrow the scope a bit because as I said the scope of the four questions together I was advised involved up to two weeks of research and of work in compilation. I am hesitant to agree with him that that amount of administrative effort is appropriate. However, if the hon Member could give an indication of which areas interest him and narrow the scope of the question a bit, I would appreciate a little more than six days notice and if he wants to ask the question at the next House we can try and compile the information for him between now and then. It is not that I do not want to give him the information it is just that if he is really that interested we would make an effort to provide it but it will take a lot of time, so if he can try and narrow the scope down to help the administrative officers who are going to have to do it, we will compile it and provide it to him either by letter or at the next House of Assembly, whichever he prefers.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think that if the Minister revisits the debate that followed Question No. 571, it appeared then that the reason why there were so many people on contract was because policy decisions had not yet been taken as to in which direction they would go in terms of the Health Authority. Three years later one would have thought that by now something would have been decided.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would just like to leave it that if the hon Member would like to look at the questions again and try and narrow the scope, as I say it is not me personally it is the people who are going to have to do all the digging out and finding files in the bottom box in a pile ten boxes high in the basement of the hospital, as opposed to opening a filing cabinet. If he can narrow it a bit it would be helpful and we would then try to provide the answers between now and the next House or in writing if he so prefers. I take it the hon Member will write to me and indicate whichever way he wants to go.

ORAL

**NO. 770 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME**

Can Government state how many vocational trainees have been successfully enrolled for the Vocational Training Scheme this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 771 of 2005.

**NO. 771 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME**

Can Government state how many potential vocational trainees have applied for the Vocational Training Scheme this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 770**

There have been 161 new entrants into the Vocational Training Scheme since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 to 7<sup>th</sup> October 2005.

**Answer to Question No. 771**

A total of 174 applications have been received to join the Vocational Training Scheme (VTS) between 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 and 7<sup>th</sup> October 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 772 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CONSTRUCTION TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state how many trainees have applied for enrolment in the Construction and Training Centre this year giving a breakdown by courses offered?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 773 of 2005.

**NO. 773 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CONSTRUCTION TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state how many trainees have been enrolled in the Construction and Training Centre this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in a schedule which I hand the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 773 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 772**

A total of 16 applications have been received between 1 January 2005 and 7 October 2005 to join the Gibraltar Construction Training Centre

The breakdown by courses offered is as follows:

<b>Applications*</b>	<b>Construction Trades – 2005 entrants</b>
3	Bricklaying
5	Carpentry & Joinery
1	Painting and Decorating
0	Plastering
5	Plumbing
2	Wall & Floor Tiling
<b>16</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>

\* These figures show Applicants' 1<sup>st</sup> preference of Trade at the time of submitting application.

As a result of aptitude tests carried out during the selection procedure, some potential Trainees then express an interest to change onto another trade.

**Answer to Question 773**

A total of 11 Trainees were enrolled in Intake 12 at the Gibraltar Construction Training Centre. The start date for Intake 12 was 3 October 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 774 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMME**

Can Government state how many trainees have applied for the Cammell Laird apprenticeship courses offered in conjunction with Government this year giving a breakdown by trade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIL AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 775 of 2005.



**NO. 775 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMME**

Can Government state how many trainees have been successfully enrolled to the Cammell Laird apprenticeship scheme this year giving a breakdown by trade offered?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule which I hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 775 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 774**

There were a total of 29 applications received to join the Engineering Trades Training Scheme 2005 Intake.

Breakdown of Engineering Trades applied for are as follows:

Applications received to join ETTS in 2005

14	Electrical Engineering
6	Mechanical Engineering
9	Welding & Fabrication
29	Grand Total

**Answer to Question 775**

All 12 new entrants into the Engineering Trades Training Scheme follow an initial “generic” training programme for around 3 months. Thereafter, based upon a trainee’s ability, they follow training leading up to NVQ Level 3 in one of the following trades:

- a. Electrical Engineering
- b. Mechanical Engineering
- c. Welding & Fabrication

Therefore, trainees who enrolled on 19 September 2005 will opt for their preferred specialised trade during December 2005.

**NO. 776 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT**

Can Government state how many peripatetic teachers are currently employed for the Pupil Referral Unit for this academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The Behaviour Education Support Team (BEST) to whom some pupils need to be referred for behaviour modification counselling and support consists of two full-time and one part-time teachers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 776 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this a slight decrease from the three that were employed last year on full-time basis? There seems to be two full-time and one part-time.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is two and a half as opposed to three, but we are now counting on the vacant post of Education Welfare Officer which as planned and redefined will include a certain commitment, an extensive commitment, to peripatetic support for disaffected pupils, and this is due shortly.

**NO. 777 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MATERNITY LEAVE**

Can Government state whether they have responded to the proposals submitted by the NASUWT in relation to maternity leave for teachers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The Department of Education and Training is working closely with the Human Resources Department to consider and prepare recommendations to Government on this issue. No formal response has yet been given.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 777 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state when they envisage to have a response to this, since the proposal, as I understand it, was well before January or February when it was submitted? I could be corrected if I am wrong on those dates but it is an issue that has come about because of the Civil Service conditions of maternity which have changed, and also EU legislation and stuff like that?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

These are matters of negotiation and can be complicated in this case, because in the case of teachers the cost implication is difficult because cover has to be supplied but I cannot give the hon Member a date that he asks for.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state whether teachers who are taking unpaid leave to extend what could be classified as a maternity unpaid leave, once they do their stint of right of maternity leave, that they are being asked either to extend that so that it does not encroach on a term? I will give an example it is very simple, if somebody finishes a maternity leave say in January, the first two weeks in January, and they want to extend that as unpaid leave for say all February, that they are not allowed to do that

until it goes to the Easter holidays. They either take up to the Easter holidays or they do not take it at all. Is that the case, can the Minister confirm this?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am sorry but I have no knowledge of that practice, I could find out.

ORAL

**NO. 778 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state how many times the Department of Education has met in relation with the Technical Services and the Gibraltar Health and Safety Inspectorate in relation to the Health and Safety policy for schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 779 and 780 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 779 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state how many times the Department of Education has met with the NASUWT in relation to the Health and Safety policy for schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 778 and 780 of 2005.

**NO. 780 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state whether the Technical Services Department and the Gibraltar Health and Safety Inspectorate have given their recommendations on the Department of Education's Health and Safety policy?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The Health and Safety Policy document produced by the Department of Education and Training was circulated, as I have announced in this House before, to all Headteachers and NASUWT as a draft. The Policy was then re-formulated based on the feedback provided, and as I also informed the House at the previous meeting, it was then submitted for the consideration of the Technical Services Department and the Health and Safety Inspectorate. The final document incorporating the input, the recommendations and advice from the latter two bodies, has now been submitted to Government for their consideration. The Department has met on an on-going basis with all relevant stakeholders as deemed necessary, including many conversations and discussions over the telephone.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 778 TO 780 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state when was the last time they conducted training in relation to the health and safety to teachers and other employees within the Department of Education?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know the date exactly but I do know that there is an on-going attention from the Department to matters of training in terms of health and safety. I am pretty satisfied and confident that the Headteachers and other teachers, particularly the technical staff in laboratories and workshops, have been given practical and on-going training and advice. What we need now really is the formulation of a policy written statement, which is now as I explained being worked out, but I want to assure the hon Member that we are all, obviously as he is, conscious of the need to have real

knowledge and practical experience and advice to the front line people in terms of health and safety in our schools.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister aware that all new recruits have to go through a course of health and safety in schools? All new recruits, teachers, cleaners, everybody who is recruited into working into a school environment, or any environment?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am sure that an on-going exercise is being carried out by the Department.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the Minister can then confirm that these training courses are being conducted probably through the probationary year and the induction course, is that correct?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is very likely that it is part of the very structured probationary, as the hon Member will know, the probation year now is quite structured to fit within the induction course that all teachers in the UK are required to carry out before they are finally approved.



**NO. 781 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

What was the cost of the toilet block, store and changing rooms at Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The cost of the extension in Bishop Fitzgerald School was £168,628.43. As a result of which the extra area being available the extension houses ten new toilets, a much-needed storage space, an extra teaching area for Years 4 and 5 Learning Support Facility pupils, and a larger staff room/teachers resources area. The lunchtime supervisors and cleaners changing room has been relocated to the portakabin which used to house the library.

**NO. 782 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRIVATE NURSERIES**

Can Government state what premises have been offered to the nursery situated at the Fleet Pavilion site for relocation and whether these premises are of a temporary or permanent nature?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

No premises have been offered as yet for the relocation of the private nursery situated at the Fleet Pavilion on either a temporary or permanent basis, but I do know that the Government are committed to providing suitable premises to this nursery to enable them to carry on the very good work that they are doing. The matter is under constant discussion with the owners of the nursery.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 782 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Government state whether they are looking for premises on a temporary or permanent basis?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know but I imagine that whilst the works on the major project in that area is being carried out there may be a need for a temporary allocation of premises, but the intention and the objective finally is to give them a permanent and suitable and agreed premises.

**HON S E LINARES:**

That permanent, suitable, agreed premises will it be within the project or the whole Mid-Town project that the Government are embarking on?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This is very much part of the logistical review of the project, which is still in the pipeline, but certainly I can assure the hon Member and the owners of the nursery know that and agree, it will be within the geographical area of that part of town.

**NO. 783 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRIVATE NURSERIES**

Can Government state how many visits have been conducted by officers of the Education Department to private nurseries since the last election?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

Officers from the Department visit private nurseries as and when necessary and appropriate. The Department does not keep a log of such visits, neither does it keep a record of the number of the many telephone calls and conversations answered in relation to advice sought by private nurseries on specific issues and specific pupils. The Department also responds to parental complaints whenever there is a concern in this respect. The Department monitors the running of most aspects of private nurseries and other agencies such as the Fire Brigade and the Environmental Health Agency monitor other relevant more physical aspects of these premises, such as health and safety matters.

Therapists from the multi-professional team (such as the speech and language therapist, the occupational therapist, the physiotherapist, all of whom have special paediatric training) go to private nurseries as the need arises and when they are called to attend to particular pupils.

All private nurseries also know that the St Martin's highly specialised Child Development Unit (pre-school unit) takes pupils as early as possible, which the hon Member will understand is very important in these cases of special needs. As a rule, pupils with very special needs are actually by agreement transferred from private nurseries to the St Martin's nursery or the Child Development Unit as it is called, or at least supported on an outreach basis and part-time basis by the specialists there.

The Principal Educational Psychologist will observe a child, again when he is asked to do so for particular reasons, in a private nursery when there is evidence of any particular problem.

**NO. 784 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL LUNCHES**

Can Government state how many pupils are staying and stayed in schools for lunch in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and this academic year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule I hand to the hon Member. Would he please note that no figures can be given for 2001 since school lunches had not started yet. We do not have the complete figures for 2005/2006 because the reception year pupils do not start on full-day schooling programme until mid October. So very soon we will know that figure but not quite yet. In any case, the figures for 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 were already provided to the hon Member in answer to Question No. 2288 of 2004.

**Answer to Question 784 of 2005**

School	January 2002*	At the start of the academic year 2003	At the start of the academic year 2004	2005**
Bayside	575	844	815	
Westside	435	395	321	
Bishop Fitzgerald	416	413	434	
Sacred Heart	241	247	230	
St Anne's Middle	347	411	388	
St Joseph's Middle	280	345	334	
Hebrew	37	23	20	
St Mary's First	158	160	155	
St Bernard's First	99	113	123	
Notre Dame First	229	307	225	
Governor's Meadow	299	307	301	
St Paul's First	229	249	253	
St Joseph's First	256	284	307	

\* School lunches started January 2002. No figures can be made available for 2001 since they had not started yet.

\*\* Results for 2005 not yet collated. Department waits to find out how many YR pupils decide to stay on – they start full-day attendance as from mid-October. We can forward this information after half-term.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 784 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would appreciate if the Minister could forward to me as soon as possible the 2005 figure. The reason why I have asked as in 2002, 2003 and 2004 is to have a correlation of the whole since it started. I also appreciate the fact that it did not start till 2002, thank you.

ORAL

**NO. 785 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – A-LEVEL EXAMS**

Can Government state how many students sat A-levels in Bayside, Westside and College of FE last academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 786 and 787 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 786 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – AS LEVEL EXAMS**

Can Government state how many students sat AS-levels in Bayside, Westside and College of FE last academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 and 787 of 2005.



**NO. 787 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCSE EXAMS**

Can Government state how many students sat GCSE exams in the last academic year giving a breakdown by school and college?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule which I hand the hon Member. May I point out that the figures quoted in this table are liable to slight adjustments to allow for the inclusion of students who are now repeating their GCSE's and examinations and once they qualify, once they attain that necessary grade, they may then join into the AS or A levels. So there will be slight adjustments to those figures, just to make sure he knows the exact state of play.

**Answer to Question 787 of 2005**

**Number of Students sitting GCSE, AS and A-level Examinations – Summer 2005**

<b>Centre</b>	<b>GCSE</b>	<b>AS Level</b>	<b>A Level</b>
Bayside Comprehensive School	169	84	67
Westside Comprehensive School	180	96	98
Gibraltar College	183	110	66
<b>Totals</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>231</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 785 TO 787 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When I am reading this table it means, for example, that in Bayside Comprehensive School where GCSE is 169 there could be a student who only sat two. Is that the case? That is included as a person because I am interested in how many persons.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We are talking about the number of students.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Exactly, this is what I am saying. A student sitting the exam so therefore 169, one student might have sat three GCSE's only and another one four, another one five, it does not matter the number that they sat the exam.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, it does not matter the number of how many exams and how many subjects.

ORAL

**NO. 788 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MANDATORY GRANTS**

Can Government provide this House with a list of courses chosen by students who have been awarded both mandatory and discretionary grants giving a breakdown by gender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 789 and 790 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 789 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY GRANTS**

Can Government state how many discretionary grants have been awarded this year giving a breakdown by gender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 788 and 790 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 790 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION – MANDATORY GRANTS**

Can Government state how many mandatory grants have been awarded this year giving a breakdown by gender?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule that I hand the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 790 of 2005****Answer to Question 788**

University Courses followed by Gibraltar Government sponsored students broken down  
by gender (Students starting in 2005)

<b>No of students</b>	<b><i>Courses Being Undertaken (Females)</i></b>
1	Adult Nursing
1	Ancient History/Archaeology
1	Archaeology and History
3	Art
1	Art & Design
2	Bar Vocational Course
2	Biomedical Sciences
1	Business Information Systems
1	Business Information Technology
2	Business Management
2	Business Studies
1	Business Studies and Spanish
1	Business Studies and Sport Sciences
1	Business Studies with Finance
1	Business Studies with History
1	Business Studies with HRM
1	Child Care & Early Years Education
1	Computer Science
1	Computing
1	Construction Design Management
1	Criminology and Social Policy
1	Dance Studies
1	Dance Theatre
1	Dentistry
1	Design Crafts
1	Design for stage & screen
1	Design Management for Fashion Retail
1	Development Studies
1	Diabetes
1	Diagnostic Radiography
1	Dip in Payroll Management
2	Dip in Pre School Practice
1	Diploma in Law
1	Diploma in surveying
1	Drama & History
1	Drama & Italian
1	Drama & Media Arts
1	Drama with Psychology
2	Early Childhood Studies
1	Early Childhood Studies with Psychology
1	Early Childhood Studies with Social Science
1	Economics
1	Economics, Finance & Banking
7	Education
1	Education Studies & Spanish
2	Engineering
4	English
1	English & American Literature and History
1	English & History of Art
1	English & Italian

**Contd Answer to Question 788****Contd Answer to Question 790 of 2005**

1	English & Spanish
1	English & Spanish Law
2	English Literature
1	Environmental Earth Science & Education
1	Environmental Studies
1	Equine Studies
1	European Studies with French & Spanish
1	Fashion
1	Film & Media
2	Fine Art
1	Fine Art & Teaching
1	French & Spanish
1	Geography
1	Geography & Environmental Management
3	Health & Social Care
1	Hebrew & Economics
10	History
1	History & Politics
2	History & Sociology
1	History of Art Architecture & Design /Spanish
1	Hospitality & Business Management
1	Human Anatomy & Biology
1	Human Evolutionary Studies
1	Human Resources Management and Business
1	Human Services
4	Humanities
1	Information Technology
1	Information Technology with Spanish
1	Interior Design
1	International Business & Economics
1	International Business Studies
1	International Management & Modern Languages
1	Introduction to Psychology
1	Journalism
1	Journalism & Communication Studies
15	Law
1	Law & Accounting
1	Law & Italian
1	Law & Spanish
1	Law and Politics
1	Law and Sociology
1	Law with Business
1	Law with IT
1	Legal Practice
1	Makaton Vocabulary Development Project
2	Management
1	Management & Tourism
1	Management Studies with Spanish
1	Marketing
1	Master of Nutrition
2	Mathematics
1	Mathematics & Education

**Contd Answer to Question 788**

1	Mathematics & Physics
1	Mathematics and Accounting and Financial Management
1	Media Studies
1	Medicinal Chemistry
8	Medicine
1	Medicine & Health Studies
1	Midwifery
2	Modern Languages
1	Money Banking & Finance
2	Music
1	Neuroscience
2	Nursing
1	Nursing and Mental Health
1	Nursing Palliative Care
1	Nursing/Midwifery
1	Nutrition & Dietetics
1	Occupational Therapy
1	P.E. & Secondary Education
1	Philosophy
1	Psychology/Education Studies
1	Physical Education
1	Physiotherapy
1	Primary Education & History Specialism
1	Politics & Development Studies
1	Politics with Media
24	Primary Education
1	Professional and Creative Writing and Media Arts
2	Professional Practice in Healthcare
8	Psychology
1	Psychology & Counselling Studies
2	Psychology & Criminology
1	Psychology and French
1	Psychology and Tourism and Leisure Studies
1	Psychology with Special Needs
1	Retail Marketing Management
1	Secondary Physical Education
1	Social Care
1	Social Policy
7	Social Science
1	Social Sciences
2	Sociology & Social Policy
1	Software Engineering
1	Spanish
1	Spanish & English
1	Spanish & Italian
1	Spanish & Tourism
1	Spanish with Television & Film Studies
1	Speech & Language Therapy
1	Sport & Leisure Management
1	Sport & Physical Education
1	Sport Health & Fitness
1	Sport Studies & Psychology



**Contd Answer to Question 790 of 2005**

**Contd Answer to Question 788**

1	Sports and PE
1	Sports Medicine
1	Sports Science
1	Sports Studies with Business
1	Study of Religions & Theology
2	Therapeutic Counselling
1	Tourism Management and French
1	Tourism Studies
1	Travel & Tourism Management
1	Upper Primary with Physical Education
1	Veterinary Medicine
1	Working with young People
1	Writing
1	Zoology
<b>No of students</b>	<b><i>Courses Being Undertaken (Males)</i></b>
1	Applied Criminology and Forensic Investigation
1	Architectural Design
2	Architectural Design & Technology
4	Bar Vocational Course
1	Biomedical Sciences
1	Business & Finance for Managers
1	Business Administration
1	Business and Law
1	Business and Management
2	Business Information Technology
1	Business Marketing
2	Business Studies
1	Business Studies with Human Resource Management
1	Civil Engineering
1	Computer Aided Product Design
1	Computer Engineering
1	Computer Science
1	Computing and IT
1	Computing Communications
2	Construction Management
1	Contemporary Dance
1	Criminology and Criminal Justice
1	Criminology/ Sociology
2	Data Communications Systems
1	Dental Technology
6	Dentistry
1	Design Animation
1	Dietetics
1	Diploma in Building Construction
1	Diploma in Nursing
1	Diploma in Surveying
1	Drums & Contemporary Popular Music
2	Earth Science
3	Economics
1	Economics & Finance
1	Economics and Politics

**Contd Answer to Question 790 of 2005**

**Contd Answer to Question 788**

1	Economics,Econometrics & Finance
1	Education & Italian
1	Education and Employment with Management Studies
1	Education Employment & English
1	Educational Doctorate
1	Electrical and Electronic Engineering
2	Electrical Engineering
1	Electronic & Communication Engineering
2	Engineering
1	Engineering Mechanics
1	English
1	English & PE Teaching
1	English and Film Studies
1	English and History
1	English Education & Employment
1	English Literature
1	English Literature & Multimedia Journalism
1	English Studies/Film & Media Studies
1	Environmental Health
1	European Economics with Spanish
1	European Law
1	European Legal Studies
1	Family & Social Policy
1	Film Studies and drama Production
1	Finance, Accounting & Management
2	Fine Art
2	Foundation Course In Art
1	French & Italian
1	French & Russian
1	Geography & Planning
1	Graphic Communications
2	Graphic Design
1	Health Care
1	History
1	History & Politics
1	History & War Studies
1	Horticulture
3	Humanities
2	Illustration
1	Illustration & Animation
1	Industrial Design
1	Information Technology & Society Key Skills for Professional Engineering
2	Interactive Multimedia
1	Interior Architecture & Design
1	Interior Design
1	International Business Spanish & German
1	International Business with Spanish
1	International Hospitality Management
1	International Relations
1	International Relations & French
1	International Relations with Strategic Studies
1	International Sports Law

**Contd Answer to Question 788**

1	Internet Communications and Networks
1	Internet Computing
1	Internet Technologies & Applications
1	Internet Technology & Multi media computing
1	Journalism
1	Languages with Professional Studies
32	Law
5	Law with Spanish
1	Law & Psychology
2	Law with Business
1	Law with Criminology
1	Law with English Literature
1	Law with French
1	Law with Hispanic Law
1	Law with Japanese
1	Leisure Management
1	Linguistics and Contemporary European Studies
1	Live Television Production
2	Marine Technology
1	Marketing Management
5	Mathematics
1	Mathematics & Physics
1	Mechanical Engineering
1	Medical Informatics
12	Medicine
1	Mental Health & Distress
1	Merchant Ship Operations
2	Modern Languages
3	Multimedia
4	Music
1	Music & Liturgy
1	Music and English
2	Music Industry Management & Live Production
1	Music Production
1	Music Teaching
1	Nutritional Consultant
1	Occupational Safety & Health
1	Palaeobiology & Evolution
1	Performing Arts
1	Pharmacy
2	Philosophy
1	Philosophy, Politics and Economics
1	Photography
5	Physics
2	Physiotherapy
1	Policing
1	Popular Music
1	Popular Music with Music Technology
4	Product Design
1	Professional and Creative Writing and Media Arts
1	Project Management

**Contd Answer to Question 790 of 2005**

**Contd Answer to Question 788**

6	Psychology
1	Psychology & Educational Development
1	Psychology & Social Policy & Administration
2	Quantity Surveying
1	Radiography
1	Real Estate Management
1	Research in Disaster Management
1	Science
1	Secondary Physical Education
1	Site Management
6	Social Sciences
1	Sociology
1	Sociology and Popular Culture
3	Software Engineering
1	Sonic Arts
1	Spanish & Psychology
5	Sport Science
1	Sports Coaching
1	Sports Coaching Management
1	Sports Development
1	Sports Health & Exercise Science
1	Sports Injuries
1	Sports Journalism
1	Sports Science & Management
1	Sports Science and Education and Employment
1	Sports Technology
2	Sports Therapy
2	Strategic Studies
1	Surveying
4	Teaching
1	Technology
1	Theatre Technology
1	Therapeutic Counselling
1	Traditional Chinese Medicine
1	Veterinary Medicine
3	War Studies

**Answer to Question 789**

A total of 15 discretionary grants have been awarded this year. Of these 5 were to females and 10 to males.

**Answer to Question 790**

A total of 176 mandatory grants have been awarded this year. Of these 89 were to females and 87 to males.

7.

ORAL

**NO. 791 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISTANCE LEARNING GRANTS**

Can Government state how many people applied for a Distance Learning grant in the year 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 792 of 2005.

**NO. 792 OF 2005****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – DISTANCE LEARNING GRANTS**

Can Government state how many Distance Learning grants have been awarded in the year 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 to date?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule which I hand to the hon Member.

May I point out to the hon Member that the number of distance-learning subsidies awarded in 2001 to 2004 was already provided to the hon Member under Question No. 1692 of 2004. I have included these figures, however, in the schedule together with the new information in 2005/2006.

**Answer to Question 792 of 2005****Answer to Questions 791 and 792**

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>No. of applications</b>	<b>No. of subsidies awarded</b>
2001-2002	56	30
2002-2003	No record available	48
2003-2004	31	20
2004-2005	29	14
2005-2006	29	22

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 791 AND 792 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister just state why there was no record in 2002/2003?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, it was a mystery to me but I am beginning to understand that it was a moment of transition between the Advisor, Mr Paul Lyons, who used to do these scholarships, he was responsible for that area, moving out when he got the post Headteacher and then another advisor, Mr George Garcia, taking over and there may have been a bit of a blip there, a hiccup, and I suppose I apologise for not having the exact records.

ORAL

**NO. 793 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TEACHING AND LEARNING RESPONSIBILITY PAYMENT**

When will Government implement the UK's Teaching and Learning Responsibilities, Excellent Teacher and Management Allowance schemes into our local system of education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 794 and 795 of 2005..



ORAL

**NO. 794 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TEACHING AND LEARNING RESPONSIBILITY PAYMENT**

Can Government explain how they are going to assimilate the UK's Management Allowance scheme into our current Education System?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 793 and 795 of 2005.

**NO. 795 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TEACHING AND LEARNING RESPONSIBILITY PAYMENT**

Can Government explain how they are going to assimilate the UK's Teaching and Learning Responsibility payment scheme into our current Education System?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

I am grateful for these questions which give me the opportunity, with the leniency of the House, to explain to the House the important, complex and pretty radical reforms in the pipeline afoot in the UK to the Educational system and the schools management structures contemplated in UK and how the Department of Education and Training locally is keeping a close watch over these developments and actually, very actively planning to adapt these changes.

The Department of Education & Training has kept itself fully briefed on the state of play in England and Wales, as the hon Member and other Members will know is full of controversy and discussion, in relation to the change-over from Management Allowances to Teaching and Learning Responsibility payments. In fact, our Education Advisers attended an intensive training session in England in June 2005 – one of the first provided for schools in England. Let me say that without being too triumphalistic about it, our Advisers were surprised at how advanced our Department was in comparison to the majority of schools and Local Education Authorities in England which appeared to be a bit lost, even at this stage. The hon Member seems to be under the impression that these changes are already in place in the UK. Far from it, this is not so.

A presentation for headteachers is already scheduled for October 19<sup>th</sup> as well as similar sessions for GTA/NASUWT and all members of the profession. A draft proposal on the new school structures has already been worked out and will be presented at the end of the presentations – well ahead of English schools where this has been scheduled for December 2006. Once this has been accomplished, schools will be given the opportunity to feed back and discuss the proposals. One major difference between UK and Gibraltar is that the introduction of the Workload Agreement (in the UK) has seen the employment in schools of other ancillary staff, in particular Learning Support Assistants (Classroom Aides). LSA's take on teaching duties and other "chores" which are being removed from teachers' job descriptions. This may not be the case in Gibraltar given that GTA/NASUWT has had no mandate from the membership to implement the Workload Agreement locally. Therefore they have not made any submission in this respect. The Department has had access to sample job descriptions in UK within the concept of the Workload Agreement, and it

is fair to say that even in England teachers are still expected to undertake certain tasks, administrative or otherwise, that are inherently linked to teaching and learning. For example, collating reports from subject teachers, actually displaying pupils' work as part of the incentive and rewarding system in the schools et cetera.

Another source of complication is that the restructuring in England is being left up to individual schools given the degree of autonomy that they have when compared to their Gibraltar counterparts. My understanding and knowledge is that in many schools headteachers have not gone in this direction because they have not got the money to. They have not got the resources to go in that direction so although there is a national Workload Agreement, when it comes to the individual schools they still have a long way to go. Here, the Department of Education & Training has been working on a common model to avoid creating inequalities and anomalies between our schools that may already exist and that this is an opportunity to overcome over the years.

I should add that the exercise is not, I think the House will understand it is complex, not a straightforward case, which means just simply shifting Management Allowances which exist today and converting them into Teaching and Learning Responsibilities. The Management Allowances are being done away with in England and we do agree because it was felt that greater emphasis related to these allowances should be placed on aspects of the Teaching/Learning process as opposed to pure administrative responsibility.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 793 TO 795 OF 2005**

##### **HON S E LINARES:**

I appreciate the explanation given by the Minister on how the current situation is. As the Minister is aware and he stated in that statement, the Management Allowances in Gibraltar locally are permanent and pensionable quite frankly. They are not like in the UK where they were given. In the UK they were given for a certain amount of years or at least for a year and then that pending whether the teacher was performing that, then they would either extend it for another year or extend it for four and five years depending on the management of the school, basically the headteacher, as is not the case here. The question therefore would be, how are Government going to reconcile the fact that we have permanent and pensionable officers already here in Gibraltar with a salary that follows with it, and incorporate the Teaching and Learning Responsibility and Management Schemes and Excellent Teachers Schemes?

##### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am pretty sure that Government must be committed to maintaining the present, in respect of permanent and pensionable, status maintaining the present system whereby allowances become part of the reckonable pension at pension stage. I am pretty sure that that could not be done away with. I am not too sure about the situation in the UK, I think this renewing of allowances year after year, on the whole I think they are consolidated. Again of course, as the hon Member knows, a lot depends on the governors of each particular school, what incentives and conditions they want to offer in terms of recruiting in the very difficult situation they have of recruiting teachers in UK. In some cases they may make these allowances

pensionable as an incentive, in other cases they do not. Whereas we have a national, global model in the UK it varies from school to school.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to the way that we run our Education system, as the Minister says is a national thing and we all have the same rather than different schools having different things, when are they going to begin the equalisation of posts? Or is this now going to be incorporated into the TLR system, and how is that going to be assimilated?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

A good point, this is one of the opportunities when certain anomalies in equalities can be now overcome, but it is complex, there will have to be a lot of negotiations, a lot of feedback from the schools. I want the hon Member to appreciate, and the House to appreciate, that the task ahead of us to be fair at all times and at the same time to be reasonable is one of the objectives that we have and is certainly being worked on. We already have a map, a scheme already worked out by the Department which, as I said on October 16<sup>th</sup>, will now be put to headteachers and to the GTA and there will have to be a process of consultation to reach the objective that we all want. A fair system and also an equitable one.

ORAL

**NO. 796 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NEW ENTRANTS**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians employed in the months from April to September 2005 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 797 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 797 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NEW ENTRANTS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the months of January to March 2005 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being submitted to the hon Gentleman in written format. However, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon Member that the information requested in Question No. 797 was supplied in answer to Question No. 191 of 2005 at the meeting of the House in April 2005. However, the information is repeated here for the convenience of the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 797**

**Schedule to Question 796**

Number of Gibraltarians who were employed in the months of April to September 2005, who were new entrants to the local labour market:

Month	Males	Females	Total
April	16	24	40
May	23	14	37
June	36	28	64

Month	Males	Females	Total
July	28	8	33
August	25	27	52
September	26	30	56

**Schedule to Question 797**

Non EEC nationals in the months of January to March 2005 who were new entrants to the local labour market broken down by nationality and job title.

January 2005	Bahamian		Brazilian		American		Israeli		Indian		Japanese		Romanian		Russian		Serbian		Turkish	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.																				
Prof.		1							2						1			1	1	
Ass. Prof						1														
Admin																				
Skilled				1																
Personal Sys																				
Sales							1													
Plant												1								
Element																				

Cont....

Cont Answer to Question 797

February 2005	Indian		Polish		Turkish	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.						
Prof.		1	1			
Ass. Prof						
Admin						
Skilled						
Personal Svs					1	
Sales						
Plant						
Element						

March	USA		Bulgarian		Canadian		Hungarian		Indian		Israeli		Polish		Romanian		Turkish		Moroccan	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.	1																			
Prof.									1	1										
Ass. Prof				1				1	1				7							
Admin																				
Skilled																	1			1
Personal Svs	1					2						1			1				1	
Sales																				
Plant																				
Element																				



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 796 AND 797 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful to the Minister. Perhaps before I move on to a supplementary question can I just confirm to the House that now that the hon Gentleman has taken over at Employment, he and I are continuing the process of providing and receiving information in relation to a number of the statistical questions that were habitually put in this House by way of written questions and answers, which I understand is also being provided to the House. In relation to Question No. 797 I am grateful for the repeat of the information from January to March 2000, I believe that when I put this question this time I actually put it for April to September, I do not know whether it is a gremlin in my system or in the House system, I am not going to visit any blame on the House since it is very likely to be in my system. Does the hon Gentleman have that information for April to September?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There are a couple of points I would like to say on what the hon Member has just said. I confirm that we have agreed that the arrangements that were in place by my predecessor will continue, however, there was a comment made to me by members of the Employment Division to the effect that some of the questions that were being asked in this Question Time actually do repeat some of the questions that are ongoing and being submitted monthly. I have not had time to actually analyse what those comments meant but when the questions and answers came back there was a comment made to me to the effect that some of these answers were already covered in the monthly or quarterly information that is being sent. But as I say, if that is the case I will bring it to his attention when I send him the figures that are due to be sent to him any day now for that. I do happen to have the information in respect of the period April to September so I will now pass that on, it is not part of the original information but I did ask for it because I really wanted to see the trend in any case for my own information.

**ORAL**

**NO. 798 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYED GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the months of April to September 2005 receiving:

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The statistical information requested is being passed on to the hon Member in written format.

**Schedule to Question 798**

**A. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT**

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	25+
April	28	29	57	14	43
May	26	30	56	16	40
June	24	21	45	19	26
July	30	29	59	19	40
August	34	34	68	28	40
September	45	31	76	26	50

**B. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	25+
April	78	55	133	25	108
May	77	50	127	22	105
June	83	49	132	23	109
July	77	54	131	18	113
August	89	57	146	21	125
September	84	58	142	19	123

**C. NO PAYMENTS**

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	25+
April	61	40	101	28	73
May	60	32	92	27	65
June	46	40	86	18	68
July	55	29	84	31	53
August	78	33	111	25	86
September	65	77	142	52	90

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 798 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just take up one of the issues that the Minister was dealing with in relation to the written questions? This question which relates to employment was at some stages answered by the Minister for Social Services because it involved an element of Social Assistance payment and Unemployment Benefit, that is why it could not fall within the arrangement that I had with his predecessor. Now that he is answering it, if he is happy I am quite happy to put this as one of the written questions that I ask regularly.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not think there is any problem with that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The number of unemployed Gibraltarian males receiving Unemployment Benefit is 28 in April and rises steadily to 45 by September, does the Minister have any indication of why that is the case? In particular, in the age group 18-25 they have exactly doubled between April and August from 14 to 28, 26 in September, is there any reason the Minister has been able to identify which relates to that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My experience in Employment is obviously very limited and short, however, I am told that this is the usual trend after the summer holidays and although I understand what he is saying that the trend is sort of rising over the six month period, if one analyses this over the year round it tends to increase after the summer. Why the sort of slight increase by months as from April I cannot really give him an explanation for that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I imagined that, certainly while the figure rises it also reduces because as people get to the end of the period when they can receive Unemployment Benefit they move from that schedule to the no payments schedule. But this seems to be not just the usual school leaver issue because at 18-25 we have got 14 but we have still got a lot of unexplained in August and September and it is a steady rise, it is not just an end of summer season when people might lose waitressing or seasonal jobs otherwise. There is nothing else which has been identified by the Ministry is there, in particular to this year?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, not that I am aware of but I will definitely take this on and enquire myself.

ORAL

**NO. 799 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

What further steps, if any, have Government taken since their last answer in this House to ensure that any works aboard the vessel Rotterdam continue to be carried out in a manner that is safe and in keeping with the Factories Ordinance and the Asbestos at Work Regulations and that further any asbestos removed from the vessel is disposed, stored (aboard or otherwise) or treated safely?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 933 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 800 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the distribution of average annual earnings as shown in Table 16 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report in respect of MOD employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 801 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 801 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the distribution of average annual earnings as shown in Table 16 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report in respect of Gibraltar Government employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 and 802 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 802 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the distribution of average annual earnings as shown in Table 16 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report in respect of private sector employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800, 801 and 803 to 813 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 803 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the numbers in the £25,000 and over category of Table 16 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the numbers between £25,000 and £29,999 and those with earnings of £30,000 and over?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 802 and 804 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 804 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government list the public sector entities and Government owned and joint venture companies that are included in the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the industrial classification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 803 and 805 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 805 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the information in Table 16 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report in respect of those public sector entities and Government owned joint venture companies included as part of the private sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 804 and 806 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 806 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government explain the reduction of male employees shown in Table 12 of the Employment Survey Report under “public administration” industry from 131 in October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 805 and 807 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 807 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the distribution of average annual earnings as shown in Table 16 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report in respect of MOD employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 806 and 808 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 808 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for part time employment in the Gibraltar Government in respect of Table 11 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 807 and 809 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 809 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for full time employment in the Gibraltar Government in respect of Table 11 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 808 and 810 to 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 810 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for part time employment in the MOD in respect of Table 11 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 809 and 811 to 813 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 811 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for full time employment in the MOD in respect of Table 11 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 810, 812 and 813 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 812 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for part time employment in respect of Table 12 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 to 811 and 813 of 2005.

**NO. 813 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for full time employment in respect of Table 12 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought by the hon Member is submitted to him in written format. However, I draw the attention to Question Nos. 800 and 807 which are exactly the same, there seems to be a repetition of questions there.

### **Schedule to Question 813**

The following tables are attached.

Q 800 and 807	Distribution of average annual earnings in respect of MOD employment, October 2004.
Q 801	Distribution of average annual earnings in respect of Gibraltar Government employment, October 2004.
Q 802	Distribution of average annual earnings in respect of private sector employment, October 2004.
Q 803	Distribution of average earnings for persons earning over £25,000 per annum, October 2004.
Q 804	Public sector entities and joint venture companies included in the October 2004 Employment Survey Report.
Q 805	Distribution of average earnings in public sector entities and joint venture companies, October 2004.
Q 808	Gibraltar Government part-time employment, October 2004.
Q 809	Gibraltar Government full-time employment, October 2004.
Q 810	MOD part-time employment, October 2004.
Q 811	MOD full-time employment, October 2004.
Q 812	Private Sector part-time employment, October 2004.
Q 813	Private sector full-time employment, October 2004.

The fall in male employee jobs at Table 12 of the Employment Survey Report of October 2004 from 131 to 104 jobs was mainly attributable to a decrease in 20 jobs within the Gibraltar Development Corporation.

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 800 and 807 – Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of All Employee Jobs, October 2004 – MoD										
	ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS			ALL MALE JOBS			ALL FEMALE JOBS			
£										
PER ANNUM	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	
0 - 999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000 - 1,499	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
1,500 - 1,999	0	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1
2,000 - 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500 - 2,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000 - 3,999	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
4,000 - 4,999	0	4	4	4	0	1	1	0	3	3
5,000 - 5,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6,000 - 6,999	1	11	12	0	1	1	1	10	11	11
7,000 - 7,999	4	9	13	13	2	2	4	7	11	11
8,000 - 8,999	2	9	11	1	2	3	1	7	8	8
9,000 - 9,999	1	6	7	7	0	0	1	6	7	7
10,000 - 10,999	3	1	4	4	1	0	1	2	1	3
11,000 - 11,999	16	2	18	8	0	8	8	2	10	10
12,000 - 12,999	94	0	94	51	0	51	43	0	43	43
13,000 - 13,999	96	0	96	48	0	48	48	0	48	48
14,000 - 14,999	49	1	50	31	0	31	18	1	19	19
15,000 - 17,499	141	1	142	97	1	98	44	0	44	44
17,500 - 19,999	136	4	140	89	0	89	47	4	51	51
20,000 - 22,499	83	0	83	72	0	72	11	0	11	11
22,500 - 24,999	58	0	58	50	0	50	8	0	8	8
25,000 and over	293	0	293	275	0	275	18	0	18	18
TOTAL	978	52	1,030	724	8	732	254	44	298	298

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 801- Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of All Employee Jobs, October 2004 - Gibraltar Government												
£ PER ANNUM	ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS			ALL MALE JOBS			ALL FEMALE JOBS					
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
0 - 999	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000 - 1,499	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500 - 1,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000 - 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500 - 2,999	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
3,000 - 3,999	8	5	13	13	1	0	1	0	1	7	5	12
4,000 - 4,999	3	1	4	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	3
5,000 - 5,999	1	3	4	4	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	3
6,000 - 6,999	3	54	57	57	1	1	1	2	2	53	55	110
7,000 - 7,999	3	121	124	124	1	1	2	2	2	120	122	242
8,000 - 8,999	2	17	19	19	0	1	1	1	2	16	18	34
9,000 - 9,999	1	11	12	12	0	1	1	1	1	10	11	21
10,000 - 10,999	14	19	33	33	4	0	4	10	19	29	48	78
11,000 - 11,999	24	12	36	36	6	0	6	18	30	48	78	126
12,000 - 12,999	45	10	55	55	13	0	13	32	45	77	122	202
13,000 - 13,999	105	4	109	109	50	0	50	55	105	155	260	415
14,000 - 14,999	70	8	78	78	28	0	28	42	70	112	182	292
15,000 - 17,499	270	6	276	276	157	0	157	113	269	422	691	1,111
17,500 - 19,999	219	4	223	223	100	0	100	119	219	338	558	897
20,000 - 22,499	198	2	200	200	85	0	85	113	197	212	409	619
22,500 - 24,999	215	1	216	216	121	0	121	94	215	309	524	839
25,000 and over	1,469	2	1,471	1,471	1,018	0	1,018	451	1,469	2,919	4,388	7,388
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,652</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>2,934</b>	<b>2,934</b>	<b>1,586</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,592</b>	<b>1,066</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>1,342</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>1,342</b>

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 802 - Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of All Employee Jobs, October 2004 - Private Sector											
PER ANNUM £	ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS			ALL MALE JOBS			ALL FEMALE JOBS				
	Full-Time		Part-Time	Full-Time		Part-Time	Full-Time		Part-Time		
	Total			Total			Total			Total	
0 - 999	0	23	0	23	0	3	3	0	20	20	
1,000 - 1,499	0	24	0	24	0	5	5	0	19	19	
1,500 - 1,999	0	39	0	39	0	8	8	0	31	31	
2,000 - 2,499	3	58	61	61	0	8	8	3	50	53	
2,500 - 2,999	42	227	269	269	13	37	50	29	190	219	
3,000 - 3,999	67	315	382	37	37	86	123	30	229	259	
4,000 - 4,999	108	433	541	59	273	332	49	160	209		
5,000 - 5,999	39	209	248	15	46	61	24	163	187		
6,000 - 6,999	130	181	311	39	35	74	91	146	237		
7,000 - 7,999	254	144	398	86	48	134	168	96	264		
8,000 - 8,999	666	116	782	305	32	337	361	84	445		
9,000 - 9,999	558	87	645	266	16	282	292	71	363		
10,000 - 10,999	604	59	663	363	11	374	241	48	289		
11,000 - 11,999	620	37	657	432	9	441	188	28	216		
12,000 - 12,999	834	34	868	612	3	615	222	31	253		
13,000 - 13,999	610	36	646	415	8	423	195	28	223		
14,000 - 14,999	803	22	825	387	0	387	216	22	238		
15,000 - 17,499	1,171	35	1,206	702	8	710	469	27	496		
17,500 - 19,999	826	17	843	515	3	518	311	14	325		
20,000 - 22,499	592	9	601	407	4	411	185	5	190		
22,500 - 24,999	496	2	498	351	1	352	145	1	146		
25,000 and over	1,696	4	1,700	1,377	1	1,378	319	3	322		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,919</b>	<b>2,111</b>	<b>12,030</b>	<b>6,381</b>	<b>645</b>	<b>7,026</b>	<b>3,538</b>	<b>1,466</b>	<b>5,004</b>		

4

Cont.....

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 803 - Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of All Employee Jobs, October 2004

£ PER ANNUM	<u>ALL</u>		<u>MALE JOBS</u>		<u>FEMALE JOBS</u>	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
25,000 - 29,999	1,139	4	796	1	343	3
30,000 and over	2,319	2	1,874	0	445	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,458</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2,670</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>5</b>



**Contd Answer to Question 813**

**Question No 804 – Public Sector Entities and Government Owned and Joint Venture Companies**

Elderly Care Agency	Health & Social Work
Europa Incinerator Ltd	Other Services
Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation	Other Services
Gibraltar Bus Company Ltd	Transport & Communication
Gibraltar Community Care	Real Estate & Business Activities
Gibraltar Community Projects	Construction
Gibraltar Development Corporation	Public Administration & Defence
Gibraltar Electricity Authority	Electricity and Water Supply
Gibraltar Health Authority	Health & Social Work
Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners	Other Services
Gibraltar Regulatory Authority	Public Administration & Defence
GJBS Ltd	Construction
Office of the Ombudsman	Real Estate & Business Activities
Social Services Agency	Health & Social Work

No details are provided by the organisations completing Employment Survey questionnaires in connection with their ownership status and the above list could consequently exclude enterprises that are public sector entities or Government owned and joint venture companies.

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 805 - Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of All Employee Jobs in PSE's & JVC's, October 2004

£ PER ANNUM	ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS			ALL MALE JOBS			ALL FEMALE JOBS		
	Full- Time	Part- Time	Total	Full- Time	Part- Time	Total	Full- Time	Part- Time	Total
0 - 999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000 - 1,499	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
1,500 - 1,999	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0
2,000 - 2,499	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
2,500 - 2,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000 - 3,999	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
4,000 - 4,999	1	240	241	0	232	232	1	0	0
5,000 - 5,999	0	15	15	0	7	7	1	8	9
6,000 - 6,999	1	10	11	0	4	4	0	8	8
7,000 - 7,999	0	13	13	0	2	2	1	1	2
8,000 - 8,999	4	8	12	1	1	2	3	7	10
9,000 - 9,999	10	10	20	6	4	10	4	6	10
10,000 - 10,999	17	4	21	4	0	4	13	4	17
11,000 - 11,999	67	3	70	36	2	38	31	1	32
12,000 - 12,999	90	2	92	67	0	67	23	2	25
13,000 - 13,999	79	3	82	48	0	48	31	3	34
14,000 - 14,999	58	1	59	31	0	31	27	1	28
15,000 - 17,499	106	2	108	40	0	40	66	2	68
17,500 - 19,999	75	1	76	44	0	44	31	1	32
20,000 - 22,499	48	0	48	33	0	33	15	0	15
22,500 - 24,999	58	0	58	40	0	40	18	0	18
25,000 and over	170	0	170	122	0	122	48	0	48
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>372</b>

Cont.....

7

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No 808 - Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, October 2004, Gibraltar Government, Part-time Employee Jobs																
INDUSTRY	ALL		GIBRALTARIAN		UK BRITISH		MOROCCAN		SPANISH		OTHER EU		OTHER		Male	Female
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		
Construction	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trans/Comm.	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Admin.	1	21	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	1	165	1	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health/Social Wk.	2	78	1	70	0	5	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Other Services	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	6	276	5	268	0	5	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0

**Cont'd Answer to Question 813**

Question No: 809 - Full-Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, Gibraltar Government, October 2004														
	ALL		GIBALTARIAN		UK BRITISH		MOROCCAN		SPANISH		OTHER EU		OTHER	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
INDUSTRY														
Shipbuilding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Manuf.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elec/Wtr Supply	145	4	141	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	251	17	221	17	5	0	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Whsle/Retail Tr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hotels/Restrnts.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trans/Comm.	87	25	86	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fin. Intermed.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Real Est./Bus.Ac.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Admin.	657	281	618	273	25	8	9	0	1	0	4	0	0	0
Education	175	289	170	284	3	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health/Social Wk.	229	432	172	343	34	74	3	0	12	10	1	4	7	1
Other Services	41	19	39	18	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,585	1,067	1,447	964	71	87	39	1	15	10	6	4	7	1

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 811 - Full-Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, MoD, October 2004													
INDUSTRY	ALL		GIBRALTARIAN		UK BRITISH		MOROCCAN		SPANISH		OTHER EU		OTHER
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Public Admin.	724	254	654	238	9	12	54	1	6	3	0	0	1
TOTAL	724	254	654	238	9	12	54	1	6	3	0	0	1

Question No: 810 - Part-Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, MoD, October 2004													
INDUSTRY	ALL		GIBRALTARIAN		UK BRITISH		MOROCCAN		SPANISH		OTHER EU		OTHER
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Public Admin.	8	44	7	37	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	8	44	7	37	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Cont....

**Contd Answer to Question 813**

Question No: 812 - Part-Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, Private Sector, October 2004														
INDUSTRY	ALL		GIBRALTARIAN		UK BRITISH		MOROCCAN		SPANISH		OTHER EU		OTHER	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Shipbuilding	9	2	4	2	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Other Manuf.	6	19	2	10	1	4	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0
Elec/Wtr Supply	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	57	38	13	22	12	10	4	2	23	3	5	1	0	0
Whsle/Retail Tr.	85	443	36	266	9	58	14	7	25	89	1	10	0	13
Hotels/Restrntr.	77	164	13	35	31	57	5	8	21	59	5	3	2	2
Trans/Comm.	29	51	24	34	2	6	1	2	2	6	0	1	0	2
Fin. Intermed.	20	158	10	125	7	24	0	0	2	7	1	2	0	0
Real Est./Bus.Ac.	289	301	262	224	14	23	3	3	6	44	2	5	2	2
Public Admin.	2	14	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Education	9	47	8	34	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	1
Health/Social Wk.	4	73	3	52	0	8	0	1	1	9	0	3	0	0
Other Services	58	156	26	71	21	28	4	4	2	48	4	3	1	2
TOTAL	645	1,466	403	888	98	224	33	27	87	277	18	28	6	22

Contd Answer to Question 813

Question No: 813 - Full -Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, Private Sector, October 2004																
INDUSTRY	ALL		GIBRALTARIAN		UK BRITISH		MOROCCAN		SPANISH		OTHER EU		OTHER		Male	Female
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		
Shipbuilding	253	12	98	8	32	0	18	1	82	3	13	0	10	0	0	0
Other Manuf.	108	44	56	32	8	5	16	1	24	4	3	2	1	0	0	0
Elec/Wtr Supply	112	14	93	14	7	0	7	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	1,352	70	455	40	290	18	121	3	430	7	44	1	12	1	0	0
Wholesale/Retail Tr.	1,416	753	723	397	132	103	148	8	339	219	23	17	51	9	0	0
Hotels/Restrnts.	418	315	75	47	61	54	115	39	121	151	26	21	20	3	0	0
Trans/Comm.	566	181	400	137	68	19	38	1	52	17	7	6	1	1	0	0
Fin. Intermed.	492	662	263	436	134	142	2	1	28	38	43	26	22	19	0	0
Real Est./Bus.Ac.	614	589	352	393	127	102	22	7	74	70	30	10	9	7	0	0
Public Admin.	102	71	96	70	4	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	3	31	3	21	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Health/Social Wk.	65	291	48	188	5	40	0	2	11	60	0	1	1	0	0	0
Other Services	881	504	342	166	317	185	28	4	47	62	79	44	68	43	0	0
TOTAL	6,382	3,537	3,004	1,949	1,185	676	517	67	1,211	633	270	129	195	83	0	0

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 800 TO 813 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to Question No. 805 which gives the distribution of average annual earnings of all employees in the public sector and joint venture companies, I take it that those are the entities listed in answer to Question No. 804 where there is a footnote showing that they are not exclusive, there may be others.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

-----

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just ask? In the schedule that I was provided by the Minister, Question No. 806 was not included.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

If one actually looks at the first page at the bottom it says that 'a fall in male employee jobs at Table 12, which I think is the contents of Question No. 806.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes I am grateful, it is just that the number was not there so I did not know.



ORAL

**NO. 814 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**TRANSPORT – VEHICLE EXAMINERS**

Can Government state whether the dispute regarding the Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department has now been resolved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 815 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported and the value of fares collected from these passengers by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited during the period April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 816 of 2005.

**NO. 816 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the quantity and value of diesel fuel and lubricant used by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited fleet of trans-buses during the period April to September 2004 and April to September 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government are a shareholder of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited. It is not a Government Department. Accordingly Government are not accountable in this House for the day-to-day minutes of the conduct of the company's business. The Government have, voluntarily, extended their accountability in this House to Government-owned companies to which a Minister is a director. This is not the case with the Bus Company. I happen to know the information sought by the hon Member and I am happy to tell him personally outside this House how much the Bus Company spends on fuel each month rather than in answer to this Parliamentary Question.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 815 AND 816 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

This is a changed policy from the past where questions of this nature have been answered. Is the Minister talking just about diesel fuel and lubricant and not the number of passengers and the value of the fares collected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, I am not aware what has been done in the past but I was under the belief that this was standard policy in this respect and that is why I have answered the question in this particular manner. I am happy to reconsider that if in fact this sort of information has been made available in the past. I have the information because I do happen to be responsible for overseeing the Bus Company. However, as it stands at this particular moment in time, I would rather keep to what I have said and I am happy to make the information available to him on a private basis but if the situation was to be different then I am quite happy to do as has happened in the past.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I can assure the Minister that in answer to Question No. 170 of 2005, which is on page 249, there is a detailed breakdown of fares by class, revenue and count. Also a question that I asked as regards the number of employees and their salaries, that was also answered in great detail, so I would ask the Minister to reconsider the change of policy and allow me to continue to ask this type of questions and answer them in detail.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am quite happy to reconsider this matter in the light of what has been said and if that is the case I will make the information readily available to the hon Member.

ORAL

**NO. 817 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**TRANSPORT COMMISSION**

Can Government state the days on which the Transport/Traffic Commission met between the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2004 and the 30 September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 833, 902, 917, 927 and 928 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 818 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**COALING ISLAND - BERTHS**

Can Government confirm what fees are being charged for the new berths for boat owners at the Coaling Island site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 819 to 821 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 819 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**COALING ISLAND - BERTHS**

Can Government confirm if preference for the allocation of berths for boat owners at the new Coaling Island site is being given to owners of boats at the Western Beach site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 818, 820 and 821 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 820 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**COALING ISLAND - BERTHS**

Can the Government confirm if the new berths for Boat Owners are already being allocated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 818, 819 and 821 of 2005.



**NO. 821 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**WESTERN BEACH - BERTHS**

Can the Government state whether they are prepared to carry out the necessary works to berths at Western Beach in view that there are a number of boat owners who wish to keep their boats there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The new berths at Coaling Island form part of a local small boat marina that the Government have built but will be operated by the Cormorant Camber Boat Owners Association, to replace the berths lost originally at the old Camber and latterly provided at Western Beach by the previous Government.

The Association has set the berthing fees in agreement with Government. The Association will also decide on criteria for eligibility to be allocated a berth and on actual allocation. However, all boat owners at Western Beach will be able to relocate to Coaling Island and the Association is aware that Government expect available berths in the future to be accessible to all bona fide small boat owners on a transparent and non discriminatory basis.

The Government have invested in the new Coaling Island Marina because Western Beach proved not to provide safe and suitable protection from the weather. Government therefore have no intention to continue to provide such berthing there once Coaling Island comes on stream.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 818 TO 821 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to the Western Beach boat owners that are currently there and do not want to move, is the Minister then confirming that nothing is going to be done for them, because apparently the fees are different from one marina because one is called a marina whilst the other is called the Western Beach Old Camber Boat Owners. What I am asking is that the Government are now confirming that nothing will be done at Western Beach to improve the situation for those who want to stay there?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

What I have said in my answer was that in an ideal situation there would not be any intention to continue that. However, what he described is actually correct, I have a meeting pending with the Committee of the Cormorant Camber Boat Owners before they actually start moving from one place to another and we need to consider all the relevant applications that have been submitted in order to see what number, if any, are left behind from those that are currently at Western Beach and do not wish to move to the new facilities. I am aware that there will be some and therefore there will be some form of facilities that will have to continue there and that is something that I know but is not what I would prefer it to happen. Having said that we are looking at the Western Beach area in any case for a future project and we are looking at options that may include some form of berthing in that area as well, so there are still a lot of options that are being currently considered for the future. However, in an ideal situation I would love to see all the people that are currently at Western Beach move to Coaling Island. I think that that will not happen and therefore Government will need to address the situation depending on numbers involved and the magnitude of it. Having said that, Government are also aware that there are many people that would love to have a berth and buy small boats, so therefore this is why possible use of the area of Western Beach for the future is something that needs to be given close consideration and will be done at the right time.

**HON S E LINARES:**

As the Minister is aware, there are quite a number of boat owners currently at Western Beach who do not want to move, it is to do with the nature of the way that the new Coaling Island marina is going to be run, and therefore they feel that moving from Western Beach to the Coaling Island area is going to be detrimental to them, they cannot afford it for a start but the issue is that they are under the impression (those staying) that the Government will sort of improve the area for them. So it would be good for the Minister to totally clarify, not with a new project in the future or whatever, we are talking about in about two month's time when the weather gets really bad as we all know in that area and whether any damages to boats. Obviously the ones who are going to move are going to try and move as quickly as they can before the weather gets worse but those who are not going to move and want to stay there will need some reassurance from the Minister as to what is going to happen.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am totally aware of all the details that he has spelt out and I have actually met a number of boat owners who feel that they did not wish to move to Coaling Island. It is clear as well that the numbers are not going to be as significant as what he says but, as I said, it is only a matter of going through the process of application and berth allocation to realise what the end product is going to be. A lot of people say that they do not want to move but in the end they are playing with two sides to the story, they are saying that they are not moving but they have applications to move. So therefore one has to really see the end result when actually the facilities are put in place and the whole procedure and process is gone through. If one looks at the facilities at Western Beach they are well beyond expectations down there and there are certain parts of the facilities there which are totally unusable, so what we will have to do is assess the numbers and what part of the facilities are actually in fairly good condition and decide whether at least in the short term those boat owners will be able to stay there in areas where the facilities are safe. So it is a matter of a step by step

situation and although I know the options that are open to the Government, I do not feel that we can commit ourselves in one direction or another until we actually see what the problem is and what the details are of what we will have in front of us, but I am fully conscious of everything that he has said and I have given certain assurances to the boat owners in that respect in any case. So even in the short term their position will be protected, it is not just because people do not want to move for a variety of reasons, some of them actually like to be down there in preference to being in Coaling Island, apart from the fact that they feel that the cost may be disproportionate to what they can afford et cetera, there are people who feel that they want to remain there because they have now got accustomed to the area. Everybody has got their own taste in life but, as I said, the Government have an obligation to look after these people and they will be looked after. However, we will assess the problems and the options open to us when the time comes.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to Western Beach again, does the Minister know whether the Port Authority who are the ones running Western Beach area are insured in any way for any claims of damages to boats that might occur in any period of time whilst they are there, and especially after the move of the boats which are going to move to the Coaling Island, after that, those staying behind are there any sort of insurance or any way in which any damages that might occur be entertained, any claims that might be entertained?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that every individual boat owner has an obligation to insure their own boat if they wish to have it insured. However, I know it is not an easy piece of insurance to obtain, some find it very difficult to do that. I know that in the case of Coaling Island I have insisted that there should be insurance as part of the facilities and, in fact, I believe that they are in the process of obtaining an insurance that covers the whole of the Club members rather than individuals, which I think is where the problem is. I would encourage the boat owners in Western Beach to do likewise, however, I do not think that they will find it easy to do even irrespective of cost. I know that I have been given an indication as to the cost issue, it is not a cost issue I think it is finding the insurance company that wishes to cover them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask the Minister to explain to the House how it is that we find ourselves in a situation where the Government develop a site to put people who are in one particular area in that site, land and even sea now being at a premium in Gibraltar, we now find ourselves that a number of the people, my Colleague has said substantial and he says not as substantial, are now insisting in not moving? Did the Government not ensure before they did the new development that everybody was happy with what was happening and they were moving or take other steps to ensure that that land or sea would be available for the projects that the Minister has said might need to be put in that area in future? How do we find ourselves in this situation?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think one has got to understand that not everybody in Western Beach wants to move in the first place. There will be a number of people that will be relocating there from other areas, for example the Watergardens area, and it may well be that what the people that are left over may all be able to fit into the Watergardens area and therefore Western Beach may have to disappear. The whole strategy will have to be decided on and finalised once we know numbers. We have estimates of numbers but we do not have firm numbers because the allocation of berths and the actual move has not yet been concluded.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the new facility that was intended from the beginning to be provided to the people who had been moved out of there, moved out of the Queensway area and taken to Western Beach, can the Minister say whether the people who were moved out of there are the ones who have priority or are there other people now that are taking up space which were not there in the first place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I cannot give that information but I think that everybody in Western Beach have had the option to move if they had wanted to. Therefore those who have opted not to want to move have done so of their own free will, it is not that anybody else has taken their place instead of and not been given the option of by the fact that somebody has had preference one over the other. Everybody has been given the opportunity to move and there are just under 300 berths in Coaling Island and there are not 300 berths in Western Beach, so everybody could have moved if they had opted to go down that route. Some of them have not but I think that the numbers are not all that big. I am quite hopeful that a good majority of them will be able to move to the area of Watergardens, where obviously they will be safer and within a much more similar regime to where they are at the moment.

ORAL

**NO. 822 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPA POINT**

Can Government say how many tenders were received for the proposed demolition of the Du Farol Building and Signal Fog House, indicating the name of the successful tenderer, the amount bid, and whether the tender was awarded to the lowest bidder or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 823 of 2005.

**NO. 823 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPA POINT**

Can Government give the cost of buying-out the owners of the Du Farol complex at Europa Point and explain whether any other property has been included in exchange as part of the deal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The owners of the Du Farol complex were granted a new 99 year lease over the adjacent shop and dwelling in August 2003. The consideration for the granting of the new lease was payment to Government of a premium of £9,250 plus the surrender of the Du Farol Restaurant/Ex Goggles night club.

Four tenders were received for the proposed demolition of the Du Farol building and Signal Fog House at Europa Point. The successful tenderer was Gibraltar Joinery and Building Services Ltd in the overall sum of £67,355.15. This was the lowest fully compliant tender.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 822 AND 823 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say when the demolition works are likely to start?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I could not give an exact date but it is now evident that this will happen fairly soon.

ORAL

NO. 824 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GRAND PARADE**

Can Government say whether there has been any change from the position at the last Question-Time in this House regarding the plans to construct an underground car park at Grand Parade?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

No.

ORAL

**NO. 825 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

What advice have Government received from utilities, heritage, environmental, town planning and any other Government departments which may be relevant in respect of the Mid-Town project, including any advice which might relate to the height of the proposed tower and to the dome to be erected in respect of the leisure centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 826 to 829 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 826 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Have there been any departures from the announced deal between the developers of the Mid-Town project and the Government and if so on what date were they agreed and what are they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 825 and 827 to 829 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 827 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Will the Government be carrying out or requiring the carrying out of an environmental impact assessment in relation to the Mid Town project, and what criteria has been established to determine whether or not the project comes within the “threshold of significance” which would require an EIA?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 825, 826, 828 and 829 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 828 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government say at what stage is the aeronautical study into the Mid-Town project?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 825 to 827 and 829 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 829 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Who has been commissioned to conduct the aeronautical study into the Mid-Town project and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There has been no departure from the announced deal with the developers of the Mid-Town project.

An environmental impact assessment of the project will not be required. In accordance with legislative requirements, the Town Planner submitted a Screening Report of the development. This was tabled before the Development and Planning Commission who were of the view that there was no need for an EIA. I endorsed the decision of the Commission.

The aeronautical study in connection with this development was commissioned by the developers at the request of the RAF and not the Government. Government are not aware of the cost of the study as this is a commercial matter for the developer alone. Government's interest is simply in the result of the study, namely that there should not be no negative impact on Gibraltar airport arising from the development. The Government understand that the study has been conducted by Halcrow Group Ltd.

It is not appropriate to give a public account or to give details to the hon Member of advice given by one Government department to another or by officials to Ministers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 825 TO 829 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can Government confirm that the original outline planning permission included the demolition of the Generating Station itself?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The demolition of the King's Bastion area, which I think is what he referred to, is actually a Government project and not submitted to planning specifications or approval even though the information was submitted to the Commission for planning information basically or for the Commission's information. So there was no actual outline planning granted for that particular scheme and in fact the project, even though it has been approved in principle by the Commission, the outline planning has not yet been issued and signed by the Chairman because we are awaiting the aeronautical study which will cover obviously the impact on the airport, but the outline planning will actually cover those areas of the development that are for the developer's account, if it is understood what I mean and not for the Government side of the project which is the Leisure Centre, the park, schools et cetera.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I clarify one point? When the Minister says that planning permission was not necessary for the demolition of the area of King's Bastion, is that the Generating Station or the demolition works inside the Bastion itself?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think we need to be clear here, there are two issues. One is an outline planning requirement, which is not required for Government projects even though the Government did submit their intentions to the Commission for information purposes and then there is a demolition permit, and that has been issued. In other words, that is more of a technical, engineering method of demolition aspect which is put through the various building control departments which basically analyse the methodology and ways of what they intend or the project they intend to demolish and that does have the permission and even Government projects are subjected to that for approval before any demolition can take place, be it the Government or the private sector.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

We know that King's Bastion is a Category 'A' listed building under the Heritage Trust Ordinance, and under that Ordinance there is a requirement for a licence in order to occupy any specific parts of any Category 'A' listed building or structure, can the Government say when such a licence was issued and to whom?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As far as I can recall, all that has been demolished in the King's Bastion area are non-historical aspects of the site. Therefore the issue which has been raised now in respect of requiring certain licences do actually apply if and when the project intervenes with any of the heritage sensitive buildings. Let me say that all through this process the Heritage Trust and the Heritage and Conservation Officer of the Government have been fully informed and they have been advising and recording all issues that are relevant to them as the progress of the demolition has taken place. I assume that as soon as we are in a position to require that licence, if we are going to have to touch or demolish any aspect of the heritage sensitive issue, that will be

complied with but my understanding is, it is not a licence that I issue firstly myself, but I am sure that if there is a requirement it would have been dealt with but I cannot give the information without having had prior notice of that.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I have the section of the Ordinance here in front of me and section 39 refers not to demolition but to occupation of the site which is listed as a Category 'A' listed building or fortification in this case, the actual quote is to occupy any specified parts of any such building, structure, site or land for any purpose specified in the licence. My understanding from what the Minister has said is that the demolition works taking place inside the Bastion is not of the historical parts of the Bastion, but certainly if the Ordinance refers to occupation and not to demolition and a licence is required for that.

**HON F VINET:**

Perhaps I can contribute in the sense that I can confirm that all the structures that have heritage value, as per the advice of the Heritage Trust, have been retained and they will not be demolished.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My question is whether in order to enter the Bastion presumably occupied to demolish the structures which do not have a heritage value, whether the licence was obtained for that as specified in section 39 of the Ordinance?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think it is debatable as to whether we are operating inside the Bastion or not. The actual courtyard there, I am not sure whether we are in the Bastion or not I would tend to say that we are outside the Bastion, the Bastion is more of the fortification and the wall which are not being touched at all. Let me say that we do have a group of experts looking at all this very closely and I doubt whether certain members of the Heritage Trust would allow any touching or occupation, whatever one wishes to call it, without having gone through the necessary loopholes and obtaining the relevant permission, authorities or licences but I cannot really give the confirmation that if any requirement that has been needed has been done.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Schedule 1 to the Heritage Trust Ordinance, which lists the Category 'A' listed buildings, includes King's Bastion and then it also includes, which presumably has also been listed, one 12.5 inch 38-ton gun and four 10 inch 18-ton guns. Does the Minister know what has happened to those? Are they still there or what is the position?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think I can answer that question. The guns are there in the upper part of the Bastion. As I recall I was connected to this project at the particular time when I was Minister for Heritage. I can confirm that the guns are up in the upper part of the Bastion.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that the case now after the demolition works or was that the case at the time when he was Minister?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The demolition has not touched the upper part or the inside of the Bastion at all, it is just the post Second World War structures in respect of the old Generating Station.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Moving on now to another question, this one relates to the environmental impact assessment on the whole project, can the Government confirm that the advice of the Planning Department or the Planning Officer was that an environmental impact assessment should in fact have been carried out on the Mid-Town project?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There was definitely areas of concern which they thought ought to be considered by a possible environmental impact assessment and rather than saying, the screening opinion which is prepared by the Town Planning Department is never a screening opinion that says it is just an opinion and they basically highlight some of the points which the Commission ought to give consideration to and not actually says 'this has to be done' unless it is a particular type of project which falls into a certain type of category, like a power station or crematorium for example. These are projects where it is compulsory to have an environmental impact assessment under EU Regulation, other projects that are less possibly sensitive to the environment in the wider sense of the word, they give an opinion as to what they feel ought to be considered and these are discussed by the Commission and a view is taken at the end by the Commission, which basically is the advice that I as Chairman follow one way or the other. In this case the Commission decided that the overall, I do remember for example one of the issues that they recommended that we ought to consider was the traffic implication. That does not need an environmental impact assessment in the view of the Commission and so the end conclusion was that there was no need for an environmental impact assessment and that was the decision which I then adopted.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

While I realise that it is certainly not compulsory or obligatory to accept the recommendations made by the Planning Department, can the Government nevertheless confirm if it is normal practice for the Development and Planning

Commission to disregard the advice or the opinion in this respect of the Planning Officer or the Town Planner?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Not generally, I think that the advice given by the Town Planner is something that is very much taken on board and their opinion is usually quite sound. Let me say that in the Commission we have representatives of the Heritage Trust, we have representatives of GONHS as well, so therefore the views are quite wide and there is a general good widespread of opinion to be able to take a reasonable and sensible decision when these matters are brought before the Commission for consideration.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

While it is true to say, as the Minister has said, that there are non-governmental organisations of that type represented in the Trust, is it not the case that the professional input and the professional advice that the DPC receive comes from the Town Planner and the Town Planning Section? Even though there are non-governmental organisations represented in the DPC is it not the case that the professional advice comes from the Town Planner and the Town Planning Section?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, and it is not just the Town Planning Section one has Technical Services represented there, there is Land Property Services, the Government architects are represented there, the MOD are represented so it is quite a wide forum of people with different expertise that each submit their views and normally there is quite healthy discussion, sometimes quite entertaining as well to follow, but I think at the end of the day decisions are taken on well-aired views across the board.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 827 can he say as Minister responsible why he felt the threshold of significance which would require an EIA was not passed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, after carrying out the discussion process and inputs from the various members, there was a general view that an EIA was not required so therefore I adopted that view and took that view on board.



ORAL

**NO. 830 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DRAFT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

How many amendments to the draft Development Plan have been made following the draft Environmental Report by Land Use Consultants of Bristol?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 831 of 2005.

**NO. 831 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DRAFT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

What was the cost of the Environmental Report into the draft Development Plan produced by Land Use Consultants of Bristol?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No amendments have as yet been made to the draft Gibraltar Development Plan following the Strategic Environmental Assessment carried out by Land Use Consultants. The Consultants made a number of recommendations and these are being considered.

The cost of the Strategic Environmental Assessment was £12,543.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 830 AND 831 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Following this environmental assessment are the Government now in a position to say when they expect the Draft Development Plan to be ready and open for public comments?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, we are at a stage now when the draft is to be put for consideration by the Development and Planning Commission and it depends how long that takes to be concluded. At that point it will go out to public consultation before it is adopted as the Plan for Gibraltar.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister then confirm that the position is that the Development Plan might be ready at a time when all the different projects have been allocated and have been given planning permission and have been built, which somewhat seems to defeat the purpose of the exercise from our point of view?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That would be applicable at any time. Whenever one issues the Development Plan there will always be a number of projects that are either going through the process or have only recently been authorised to proceed. We are still working on the target date of having the Development Plan in place by the end of the year, which I think is what I have informed before in this House.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Practically every year because obviously the target date seems to be shifting and changing all the time, but is it not the practice for these plans to be produced every ten years and that therefore this one is already four years out of date?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We have already discussed that before, it is a reality that it is delayed, when I came into office in November 2003 and took responsibility for DTI and Planning I took it upon myself to address this issue as quickly as I have been able to and the development of a Gibraltar Development Plan is not something that one can do overnight. One has to go through a process but I think the hon Member will be pleasantly surprised when he sees the report, it is a vast improvement of anything he has seen before.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

We do not doubt for one moment we will end up with the best plan in the world, after all the developments have been constructed and put in place and approved.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Gibraltar will continue to develop after I publish the plan. I hope that the plan will not mean that there will be no more developments in Gibraltar.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister if the Government are satisfied that all developments which are now in the pipeline comply with the 1991 Plan which is the existing plan that we have in place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We definitely do refer to that Plan when considering projects which could be sensitive in certain areas and I believe that the Commission has maintained its position as far as the 1991 Development Plan is concerned as much as possible, allowing for the fact that Gibraltar has moved on and the time that has elapsed there has to be an element of flexibility and criteria to be adopted in order to allow Gibraltar to progress without being held to ransom by the 1991 Development Plan.

ORAL

NO. 832 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**BONDED STORES**

At what stage is the Government review of the bonded stores system?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

An internal review is still in process. It is not yet possible to say when this will be completed.

ORAL

**NO. 833 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 14 April 2005 and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 817, 902, 917, 927 and 928 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 834 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many representations have been received by the Development and Planning Commission with respect to the application to construct a residential nursing home at the Old Junior Ranks Mess, Lathbury Barracks, and how many supported the project or were against it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 836, 838, 841, 843, 844, 846, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 835 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS – OLD JUNIOR RANKS MESS**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the application to construct a residential nursing home at the Old Junior Ranks Mess, Lathbury Barracks, and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 837, 839, 840, 842, 845, 847, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 836 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**RODGER'S ROAD**

How many representations have been received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application to construct two town houses at 10/12 Rodger's Road, how many supported the application and how many were against it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 838, 841, 843, 844, 846, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 837 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**RODGER'S ROAD**

Has planning permission been granted to Honeyfern Ltd in respect of the application to construct two town houses at 10/13 Rodger's Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 839, 840, 842, 845, 847, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 838 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CREMATORIUM**

How many representations have been received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the project to construct a Crematorium and Clinical Waste Incinerator at Devil's Bellows, Windmill Hill, how many supported or opposed the project and has planning permission been granted or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 841, 843, 844, 846, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 839 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LOQUAT HOUSE**

Can Government say whether the Development and Planning Commission has approved the application for planning permission for the construction of a swimming pool at Loquat House, South Pavilion Road and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 840, 842, 845, 847, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 840 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PLANNING PERMISSION BY OVP LTD**

Can Government say whether the application for planning permission by OVP Ltd to construct commercial premises with apartments above at the site bounded by CP1301, 1301A to the East and CP1317 to the West has been granted and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 839, 842, 845, 847, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 841 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PLANNING PERMISSION BY OVP LTD**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application by OVP Ltd to construct commercial premises with apartments above, and how many were in favour or against the project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 838, 843, 844, 846, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 842 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SUNRISE MOTEL**

Can Government say whether the application for planning permission to the DPC by Andrews Kent and Stone (Engineers International) to construct two additional storeys to the Sunrise Motel has been granted and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 839, 840, 845, 847, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 843 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SUNRISE MOTEL**

Can Government say how many representations were made to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed construction of two additional storeys to the Sunrise Motel, stating how many were in favour and how many were against the project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 838, 841, 844, 846, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 844 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NORTH MOLE – EX MOT CENTRE**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application for planning permission by Longhorn Properties Ltd to construct an office block at CP1376 Ex MOT Centre, North Mole Road and how many were in favour or against the development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 838, 841, 843, 846, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 845 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NORTH MOLE – EX MOT CENTRE**

Has planning permission been granted to Longhorn Properties Ltd in respect of the application to construct an office block at the Ex MOT Centre, North Mole Road, and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 839, 840, 842, 847, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 846 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUENA VISTA ROAD**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application for planning permission to construct five houses at 2 Buena Vista Road, and how many were in favour or against the project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 838, 841, 843, 844, 848, 851 and 852 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 847 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUENA VISTA ROAD**

Has planning permission been granted to the proposed development of five houses at 2 Buena Vista Road, and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 839, 840, 842, 845, 849, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 848 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SIR HERBERT MILES ROAD**

How many representations have been received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application to construct three detached houses with garages at Sir Herbert Miles Road south of the Caleta Hotel, stating how many supported the project and how many were against it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 838, 841, 843, 844, 846, 851 and 852 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 849 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SIR HERBERT MILES ROAD**

Can Government state whether planning permission has been granted in respect of the project to construct three detached houses with garages at Sir Herbert Miles Road, and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 839, 840, 842, 845, 847, 850 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 850 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**QUEENSWAY QUAY CAMBER**

Can Government say whether the application for planning permission to the DPC by Andrews, Kent and Stone (Engineers International) to construct 37 apartments at Queensway Quay Camber has been granted and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 835, 837, 839, 840, 842, 845, 847, 849 and 853 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 851 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**QUEENSWAY QUAY CAMBER**

How many representations were received by the DPC in respect of the application for planning permission to construct 37 apartments at Queensway Quay Camber?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834, 836, 838, 841, 843, 844, 846, 848 and 852 of 2005.

**NO. 852 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ELIOTT HOTEL**

How many representations have been received by the Development and Planning Commission with regard to the application for planning permission to construct a multi-storey annexe to the Elliott Hotel, how many were in favour of the project and how many against?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Representations against these projects were received as follows:-

<b>OVP Limited Project</b>	1 objection
<b>Crematorium and Clinical Waste Incinerator</b>	2 objections
<b>2 Buena Vista Road</b>	16 objections
<b>Queensway Quay Camber</b>	56 objections
<b>Elliott Hotel Annex</b>	18 objections

No other representations were made in respect of any of the other projects.

Planning permission has not yet been granted to the Crematorium and Clinical Waste Incinerator project.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 834, 836, 841, 843, 844, 846, 848, 851 AND 852 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Crematorium has planning permission not been granted because it has not been considered yet by the DPC or has it been considered and refused?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the DPC has had a submission made to it but it will require an EIA and so therefore, until the EIA is done the Commission will not give consideration to the application. In this case it is a compulsory EIA, it is not something that the Commission can take a view on.



**NO. 853 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ELIOTT HOTEL**

Has planning permission been granted for the construction of a multi-storey annexe to the Elliott Hotel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Planning permission has not been granted in respect of any of the above projects, with the exception of the residential home at Lathbury Barracks. This last application has been approved by the Development and Planning Commission and the planning permit will shortly be signed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 835, 837, 839, 840, 842, 845, 847, 849, 850 AND 853 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In respect of the projects for which planning permission has not been granted can the Minister say again whether this is because they have not discussed it yet or whether it has been discussed and rejected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, in the list that is supplied there are some that have been discussed and rejected, there are others that have not been considered yet and others that have been discussed and will require further discussion. Basically, the whole list of projects that have been listed fall into those three categories.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister state which have been rejected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would not like to comment on the meeting we had yesterday afternoon, the minutes of which have yet not been done so therefore it would be inappropriate for me to comment on that, but it only actually affects only one project. One that has been rejected is the Caleta Hotel. The rest are on-going projects that are in the progress of going through discussion. One has to remember that decisions are not always taken in one particular meeting, there are times that we need to take matters forward for discussion, there are times when applications have to go back to the applicant for further information or clarification and therefore that means that it can take maybe one or two or three meetings when the applications are given consideration.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister, in relation to the Elliott Hotel project is that one of the projects which is pending further information or further discussion?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, that was one of the projects that was discussed yesterday and therefore it is better for me not to comment, it would be unfair for me to comment because the applicant does not know as yet what the outcome is and so therefore it would be unfair for me to make it known in the House and for the applicant to find out through the media rather than through a proper notification.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister able to give any details at all on it? For example, we are not asking whether it has been rejected outright, whether perhaps it is going to be modified?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The only thing I can say is that the Commission were not satisfied with the project as presented and we took a decision yesterday on the way forward, I think, but there have been discussions with the developers on possible alterations and possible alternatives. The main issue is the height within the Town area which I think is something that the 1991 Development Plan actually clearly states has a restriction on the height within the City Walls.

ORAL

**NO. 854 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government list the projects which are not yet complete and which have been granted Development Aid as at 30 September 2005 giving the date when Development Aid was originally granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 855 to 857 and 869 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 855 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government list the projects which are not yet complete and which have been granted Development Aid showing the original date by which the project was expected to be complete for the purposes of the Development Aid Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 854, 856, 857 and 869 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 856 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government list the projects which are not yet complete and which have been granted Development Aid where extensions of time have also been granted for the purposes of the Development Aid Ordinance showing the project and the time extension?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 854, 855, 857 and 869 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 857 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government list the projects which are not yet complete and which have been granted Development Aid giving details of each development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 854 to 856 and 869 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 858 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid in respect of the project by Souwest Developments Ltd (Licence No 4 of 1999)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 859 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 859 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say why the Development Aid Licence No 7 of 2003 which was issued to Queensway Quay Development Ltd was cancelled on 28 February 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858, 860 to 868 , 870 and 871 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 860 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid in respect of the project known as Gun and Ordnance Wharf by Queensway Quay Development Company Ltd (Licence No 4 of 2003)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858, 859, 861 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 861 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid in respect of the project known as Cormorant Wharf by Queensway Quay Development Company Ltd (Licence No 3 of 2003)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 860, 862 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 862 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid in respect of the project by Slop Oil Reception and Treatment Ltd (Licence No 2 of 2003)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 861, 863 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 863 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works in respect of the project above 39 Glacis Road as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 862, 864 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 864 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say whether the construction project by Sand Key Properties Ltd above 39 Glacis Road which was granted Development Aid Licence No 6 of 2004 was completed by 12 months after commencement as stipulated in the licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 863, 865 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 865 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid, of the project for which Silverlake Ltd was granted Licence No 5 of 2003 as amended on 28 February 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 864, 866 to 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 866 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say whether the project by Silverlake Ltd, for which Development Aid Licence No 5 of 2003 was amended extending the date of completion to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005, has now been completed as stipulated in the amended licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 865, 867, 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 867 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works in respect of the project by Taylor Woodrow, for which Development Aid Licence No 3 of 2004 was granted and amended on 28 February 2005, as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 866, 868, 870 and 871 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 868 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say whether the project by Taylor Woodrow at Sandpits Vaults for which Development Aid Licence No 3 of 2004 was amended extending the date of completion to 30 June 2005 has now been completed as stipulated in the amended licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 867, 870 and 871 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 869 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the original completion date for the project by Gala Casino (Gibraltar) Ltd which was subject to Development Aid Licence No 4 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in these questions are being handed over in written format.

**Answer to Question 869****DEVELOPMENT AID**

Project	Project Completion Date	Date of Development Aid Licence	Completion date Extended Until	Date when Extension of Licence Granted
Construction of a six-storey office building at site of 55 Line Wall Road	31/12/05	01/07/03	30/06/06	05/11/04
Construction of 157 units with 272 car park spaces at Plot A Europort to be known as Europlaza	30/09/05	01/07/03	30/09/06	05/09/05
Conversion of the former Barrack building at Town Range into 11 houses, offices, garages and car parking spaces	31/07/06	01/07/03	N/A	N/A
Upgrading of Gibtelecom network to be able to offer 2G and GPRS	30/09/03	01/07/03	31/12/05	05/09/05
Construction above the showroom at 39 Glacis road of 18 Flats on 3 floors	31/07/05	06/07/04	31/12/06	10/01/05
Construction at Sandpits Vaults of 4 houses plus external works	31/12/04	02/08/04	30/06/05	28/02/05
Construction of 19 luxury houses on reclaimed land to be known as The Island	27/07/06	02/08/04	N/A	N/A
Construction of 20 apartments, swimming, & external works at Europa Road (adjacent to Rock Hotel)	31/12/06	06/07/04	N/A	N/A
Essential structural repairs and internal	18/03/05	02/08/04	31/03/06	23/05/05

1

Cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 869**

Project	Project Completion Date	Date of Development Aid Licence	Completion date Extended Until	Date when Extension of Licence Granted
alterations to the International Casino				
Construction of 4 houses, 39 apartments, swimming pool and external works at the site of Building A Royal Naval Hospital, Europa Road	31/12/06	10/01/05	N/A	N/A
Construction of office accommodation at the building situated at 85 Main Street	15/01/06	10/01/05	N/A	N/A
Construction on the Eastside reclamation of a small cruise terminal, hotel, marina, car parks, affordable and luxury housing, offices, shopping precinct, cinemas, nightclubs	31/12/16	28/02/05	N/A	N/A
Construction at the Ex Mackley Yard Europa Road of 11 residential units, 23 carpark spaces, 11 domestic stores, gymnasium and associated amenities. To be known as Genista House	30/06/06	28/02/05	N/A	N/A
Construction, at the site south of the Caleta Hotel, of 2 Studio Apartments/Suites, 29 One bedroom Apartments/Suites, 3 Penthouse Suites each with small private swimming pool, 16 internal car park spaces and 15 external car park spaces	31/10/07	28/02/05	30/04/08	05/09/05

**Contd Answer to Question 869**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Completion Date</b>	<b>Date of Development Aid Licence</b>	<b>Completion date Extended Until</b>	<b>Date when Extension of Licence Granted</b>
Construction, at Marina Bay of Eighty-one apartments and six commercial units plus external works and swimming pool	31/12/08	23/05/05	N/A	N/A
Construction, at the site of the former Sheppard's Marina, of 132 residential apartments and 1,700m of commercial space, including the beautification of the area with plantations, boardwalks, new promenades, piers, pontoons, walking and relaxation areas including some 40,000 sq ft of plants, pools and gardens	31/03/07	23/05/05	N/A	N/A
Construction of 12 Town Houses at 4 Rodger's Road	31/05/05	23/05/05	31/12/05	05/09/05
Construction at 13/21 John Mackintosh Square of a new building, adjacent to the Treasury Building and City Hall	30/06/07	23/05/05	N/A	N/A

ORAL

**NO. 870 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say whether the project at Lord Napier Mews which was granted Development Aid Licence No 8 of 2005 was completed before 31 May 2005 as stipulated in the Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 858 to 868 and 871 of 2005.

**NO. 871 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government say what was the cost of the works in respect of the project at Lord Napier Mews as determined by the Financial and Development Secretary in his discretion for the purposes of Development Aid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Accounts have not yet been submitted by the developer in respect of any of the developments, so the Financial and Development Secretary has been unable to quantify the cost of the works for the purposes of development aid.

No request has been made for a further extension of the licence granted to Silverlake Ltd beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005, or to the Sandpits Vaults project beyond 30<sup>th</sup> June 2005.

The development aid licence granted to Lord Napier Mews was extended to 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2005, and that granted to Sand Key Properties Ltd to 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2006.

In relation to Development Aid licence 7 of 2003, the applicant sought material changes to the project and a fresh application for development aid was made for the larger project. This was approved, and at that stage licence 7 of 2003 was cancelled.

ORAL

**NO. 872 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SANDY BAY**

Can Government give the dates when Sandy Bay has been cleaned since 31 May 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 873, 874 and 877 of 2005.



ORAL

NO. 873 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**CAMP BAY**

Can Government give the dates when the pools at Camp Bay have been closed or out of action this summer season?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 872, 874 and 877 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 874 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAMP BAY**

Can Government say whether the maintenance of the pools at Camp Bay were contracted to a private firm for a time period and if so when and what firm was it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 872, 873 and 877 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 875 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAMP BAY**

Have Government received any complaints against diving schools from across the border diving from Camp Bay during the official bathing season before 6 pm?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 876 of 2005.

**NO. 876 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DIVING IN GIBRALTAR WATERS**

Can Government confirm whether the Mancomunidad de Municipios have raised the issue of diving in Gibraltar waters at any level?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The issue of diving in Gibraltar waters was raised tangentially at a port-related meeting at which the President of the Mancomunidad de Municipios was present, simply to obtain clarification on the Government's position. This continues unchanged, and in simple terms, there is no discrimination in Gibraltar between individuals of whatever nationality who wish to enjoy diving as a leisure pursuit.

The only complaint received with regard to diving at Camp Bay was contained in the petition from Camp Bay users that was sent to the Gibraltar Tourist Board, I think it was some time in late August.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 875 AND 876 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Mancomunidad raised this issue in the meeting between Gibraltar and Algeciras ports were they raising the points of individuals diving in Gibraltar waters or was it companies organising excursions for diving in Gibraltar waters?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the issue was raised by the President of the Mancomunidad and myself as we were walking from the meeting room to another location and he raised the issue of what the Government's position was in respect of individuals diving in Gibraltar, which is what I have answered in the letter. I know there are issues in respect of companies coming into Gibraltar but the issue that was raised was with respect to individuals.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What response was given to the Camp Bay users who complained that these companies were coming into the beach, on occasions driving down to the seashore itself and diving in the waters of Camp Bay before 6.00 pm during the Official Bathing Season?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

In the letter that the Gibraltar Tourist Board sent the Camp Bay users it said 'I confirm that divers are allowed on the beach as long as their equipment is not left unattended and they do not have spear guns'.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the policy of the Government then that diving companies based in foreign countries have the right to come into Gibraltar and dive from Gibraltar beaches at any time, day or night, as long as they do not leave their equipment lying around and do not use spear guns?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I know that this is a sensitive issue in respect of the fact that there are local diving schools that obviously feel undermined by this. However, it is very difficult for us to be able to differentiate between an individual or a group of friends coming to dive and somebody coming with a group of a diving school outside. Let me say that we try to discourage companies or diving companies from across the border to come through and dive in Gibraltar, however, the policing of that is very difficult to justify.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Minister not accept that far from being difficult to distinguish between individuals and companies it is actually very easy because in most cases they come in huge vans with either the name of the hotel on the side or the name of the diving company and the phone number, and that they are visible in the beaches including Camp Bay, or indeed coming in through the border?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As he has just described, foreign visitors coming in to dive will have come through the border with their equipment and the fact that they come in a van with signs and everything, paraphernalia on it, does not actually make them any different to anybody coming with their own cars. It is very difficult to police. It is something that I have discussed with Customs, with Police, to see whether anything can be done in this respect, however, it is difficult to actually take any possible action against them.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government aware that as a result of these activities there are established businesses in Gibraltar, who obviously pay tax and employ people here, that are virtually being pushed out of business and out of existence because of this, and what action are they prepared to take to remedy the situation?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am aware that some of the local diving schools, which I think I have pointed out earlier on in my answer, have expressed concern to me about the matter. The fact that they are out of business, I think they are targeting completely different markets and that diving schools in Gibraltar actually have their own customer base, which is mainly the UK, that come in and dive in Gibraltar. I think the bigger problem is the fact that they are restricted to a particular area and so therefore they find that when they wish to turn up with their own customers they find that there are individuals using them, which they claim to be from a diving school across the Bay or across the border and that obviously is not something that they particularly like, but it is not easy to solve or find a solution to it.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has identified the problem, it is not that they are being driven out of business because the diving schools from Spain are stealing their customers, because as he says they are different customers. They are being driven out of business in terms of the limited diving sites that exist around Gibraltar and that is a serious problem and it is there that action is needed from the Government. From what I hear really it serves as scant consolation to these locally established firms.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It is something that is being actively pursued, it is not something that has been allowed to be left unattended, but a proper solution in order to regulate operators is not something that has as yet been able to be found.

**NO. 877 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAMP BAY**

Have Government responded to the complaints made by Camp Bay users in August about issues affecting the beach and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Sandy Bay was cleaned daily during the Bathing Season, from 11<sup>th</sup> June to 12<sup>th</sup> September 2005 inclusive. The beach was also cleaned during the weekend 3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> June, and on 8<sup>th</sup> October.

The pools at Camp Bay were unavailable to the public on seven days during the whole of the bathing season. The actual dates when the pools were closed were not recorded.

Maintenance of the pools was not contracted to a private firm.

The Gibraltar Tourist Board responded to the complaints made by Camp Bay users on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 878 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BEACH CONCESSIONS**

Can Government list the successful tenderers in respect of the Beach Concessions Kiosks for the official Bathing Season 2005, indicating the name of the successful tenderer and its location, the amount bid by each successful tenderer, and how many tenderers there were in respect of each site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 879 to 882 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 879 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BEACH CONCESSIONS**

Was the kiosk in the area of Western Beach included in the tender for beach concessions for the summer season 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 878 and 880 to 882 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 880 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BEACH CONCESSIONS**

Can Government list the successful tenderers for Beach Concessions for the Bathing Season 2005 showing the successful tenderer, the location, the nature of the concession and the amount bid in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 878, 879, 881 and 882 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 881 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BEACH CONCESSIONS**

Can Government confirm that the tender for beach concessions were awarded in all cases to the highest bidders?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 878 to 880 and 882 of 2005.

**NO. 882 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WESTERN BEACH**

Can Government confirm whether the land access for the general public to Western Beach this summer has been through a hole in the fence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is on the attached schedule.

**Schedule to Question 882**

The persons who successfully tendered for Beach Concessions and Kiosks for the 2005 bathing season were:

- |     |                           |   |  |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
| (a) | <u>Beach Concessions:</u> |   |  |
|     | Eastern Beach             | - | Mr J Ellul<br>Hire of sunbeds and beach umbrellas.                 |
| (b) | <u>Kiosks</u>             |   |  |
|     | Eastern Beach             | - | Mr M Sene and Mr P Parody<br>Sunrise Kiosk, at south end of beach. |
|     | Western Beach             | - | Mr C Chichon<br>Kiosk at south end of beach.                       |
|     | Camp Bay                  | - | Mr A Debono<br>Willy's Return Kiosk, Camp Bay south promenade.     |
|     | Little Bay                | - | Mr A Debono<br>Sunset Kiosk, north end Little Bay.                 |

There were three tenders for a Western Beach Kiosk, and only one tender for each of the other concessions.

Persons allocated a beach concession pay a weekly licence fee to Government of £25 for each of the 13 weeks of the official bathing season. No premium is charged for the grant of a beach or kiosk concession.

Access to Western Beach was not through a broken fence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 878 TO 882 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister says in the written reply, I do not understand why it has been bundled in with other questions which are perhaps more voluminous in their reply, that access to Western Beach was not through a broken fence. Can the Minister say what was the land access to Western Beach this past summer season, through where did people have to go through?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Access to Western Beach is through the area where the Western Beach boat owners are, where there used to be a fence not so long ago, there used to be a hole through the fence where people used to go through and get into Western Beach when the MOD would not allow us access to Western Beach through there, that fence has been removed and there is a gap. There is no fence there anywhere apart from the side so there has been a distinctive entrance made to the beach. One now arrives in style.

ORAL

NO. 883 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ROCK APES**

Have the Moroccan authorities now indicated whether they are willing to receive Rock apes from Gibraltar?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

No they have not. Discussions are continuing and a reply from the Moroccan authorities is still awaited.

**ORAL**

**NO. 884 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – UPPER ROCK**

Can Government list what remains to be done in the development of Hay's Level and Princess Caroline's Battery before the contract for tours of the area is put out to tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The work consists primarily of three areas of work:-

- providing adequate toilet facilities for the area, which will also service the Great Siege Tunnels;
- completing the pedestrian link from the Middle Galleries via the Lower Union Communication to Casemates Square; and
- constructing the entry/exit point to the visitor attraction in the area of Casemates.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 884 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister indicate which of these three requirements are now complete or which of them have now started the road to completion?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, none of the three have been started. This is an EU-funded project which will commence in the next financial year.

**NO. 885 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MINISTERS' OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister with responsibility for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business since 8 March 2005 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I have not been away from Gibraltar in my capacity as Minister for Tourism since 8<sup>th</sup> March 2005, to attend any event or function.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 885 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business in any other capacity?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, but I have not got the details here with me, but on very few occasions.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would the Minister supply the information in writing?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes of course.



**NO. 886 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOURISM SUB-COMMITTEE**

Have there been any meetings of the tourism sub-committee which was set up between Gibraltar and the Mancomunidad and if so on what dates has the sub-committee met?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There has been one meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 886 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what the purpose or the agenda for the meeting was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It has been a long time since that happened but I believe that the agenda at the time was to consider joint marketing initiatives and possible joint product sales in order to promote people to the area, visiting both Gibraltar and the hinterland. Let me say that although there has been this such meeting of the sub-committee, there is on-going communications and for example they attended the Workshop that we did in Madrid and recently they attended the one in Barcelona as well, which I think is in the order of questions as well later on in the Order Paper. So there is on-going contact but there has not been formal meetings.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the joint marketing include the use by conference centres in the neighbouring town of the Rock of Gibraltar as a marketing image on their posters? I recall that happened recently with the Boxing Conference which was organised in La Linea.

**HON J J HOLIDAY:**

No it is not but I actually welcome it, I thought it was excellent international publicity for us, especially to have the Union Jack quite prominently on the poster itself as well. So it is not something that is an initiative of this committee but quite a welcome move without being involved.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

It would have been a welcome move if the conference had taken place in Gibraltar and not in La Linea. I also seem to recall that it was not only the Union Jack that was displayed but most of the flags of the participating countries were displayed in a sort of banner across the top around the Rock. Certainly I think it conveyed a misleading impression that this conference was taking place here and that the Rock was used as a marketing tool by people from across the border.

ORAL

**NO. 887 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's participation in the first international Hunting, Fishing and Tourism Fair held in Los Barrios from 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 888 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 888 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

Who made up the official Gibraltar delegation at the International Hunting, Fishing and Tourism Fair held in Los Barrios in September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887, 889 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 889 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How many exhibitors participated in the International Hunting, Fishing and Tourism Fair held in Los Barrios and who were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887, 888, 890 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 890 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's participation in a destination exhibition and workshop in Barcelona on Wednesday 5 October and who made up the official Gibraltar delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 889, 891 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 891 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How many members of the Gibraltar travel trade participated in the destination exhibition and workshop in Barcelona on 5 October and who did they represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 890, 892 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 892 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

What was the contribution made by the Mancomunidad de Municipios in exchange for being allowed to host a table at a workshop during Gibraltar's participation in a destination exhibition and workshop in Barcelona on 5 October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 891, 893 to 897 and 929 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 893 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of organising and attending the destination exhibition and workshop hosted at the Hotel Melia Madrid Princesa on Wednesday 20 April 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 892, 894 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 894 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How many members of Gibraltar's travel and tourism industry attended the destination exhibition and workshop at the Hotel Melia Madrid Princesa on 20 April and who did they represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 893, 895 to 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 895 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How many Spanish travel agents and representatives of the Spanish media were invited to attend the destination exhibition and workshop at the Hotel Melia Madrid Princesa, how many actually attended and who did they represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 894, 896, 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 896 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

What was the cost with a breakdown and what were the results of the Joint Tourism Workshop between Gibraltar and the Mancomunidad that took place at the John Mackintosh Hall in May?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 895, 897 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 897 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How many businesses from Gibraltar and how many from the Campo participated in the joint tourism workshop that took place at the John Mackintosh Hall in May and who were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 887 to 896 and 929 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 898 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR**

Has the vacancy for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator in the Gibraltar Office in Madrid now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 899 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 899 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR**

How many persons applied for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator at the Gibraltar Office in Madrid when it was re-advertised and how many were Gibraltarian?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The vacancy has not been filled as yet.

Three persons have applied for the post including one Gibraltarian and one British citizen of Gibraltarian descent.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 898 AND 899 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I noted that the vacancy was advertised in March and then it was re-advertised again in June, is it because nobody applied in March?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, there were no applicants in June. The first time round those that applied did not meet the bill. The second time round nobody applied and now there was another advert, I think, that went out some time in September and interviews have just been conducted and recommendations have already been made to the Government for a decision to be taken.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister said one person was a Gibraltarian and one was a British citizen of Gibraltarian descent, can he say what the nationality of the third person was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not know because the third person has not been recommended, he was not interviewed, so I am afraid that the third person was not interviewed because he did not meet the relevant requirements.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Gibraltar Marketing Coordinator in the Office in Madrid is something which we have debated in this House many times, it has obviously now been vacant for many months, can the Minister say who is manning the Gibraltar Office in all this time or has the office closed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the office is open there is an administrative coordinator there and so the office has been run by one person with some assistance from Gibraltar, and there is one of the managers who visits Madrid every month for two or three days just to keep an eye on some of the areas which traditionally have been looked after by the Marketing Coordinator, which is not in post at the moment.



**ORAL**

**NO. 900 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from April 2005 inclusive:

- (a) by charging coaches that use the coach park;
- (b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock;
- (c) in admission fees to the Gibraltar Museum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

## **Schedule to Question 900**

### **Tourism Revenue**

(a) Coach Park Fees

<u>2005</u>	<u>Amount (£)</u>
April	9,220
May	8,820
June	8,160
July	6,550
August	6,670
September	9,780

(b) Upper Rock Fees

<u>2005</u>	<u>Amount (£)</u>
April	219,650
May	271,999
June	226,761
July	267,882
August	313,137
September	301,438

(c) Gibraltar Museum Fees

<u>2005</u>	<u>Amount (£)</u>
April	1,534
May	1,522
June	1,220
July	1,285
August	2,881
September	1,435

ORAL

**NO. 901 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said:

- (a) that they had stayed at a hotel;
- (b) that they had not stayed at a hotel;

since February 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location, and in the case of those who stayed in hotels what was the average length of stay in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested is set out in the attached schedule.

**Schedule to Question 901**

**Place of Interview  
Number of Interviews Stayed at Hotel**

	Total No Interviews	Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Average Length of stay	Frontier	Average Length of stay	Elsewhere	Average Length of stay
Feb 05	1,485	5	5	7.5	-	-	-	-
Mar 05	1,316	15	14	5.9	1	14.0	-	-
Apr 05	1,562	27	27	4.3	-	-	-	-
May 05	1,604	29	28	6.8	-	-	1	7.0
Jun 05	1,746	26	26	6.3	-	-	-	-
Jul 05	1,714	13	13	4.6	-	-	-	-

**Place of Interview  
Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel**

	Total Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Port	Frontier	Waterport	Marina	Coach
Feb 05	1,480	27	-	1,298	-	2	153
Mar 05	1,301	14	14	1,076	-	-	197
Apr 05	1,535	30	173	1,046	1	22	263
May 05	1,570	70	171	1,220	-	5	109
Jun 05	1,720	16	60	1,535	-	-	109
Jul 05	1,701	7	38	1,574	-	3	79

The information from August 2005 is not yet available.

ORAL

**NO. 902 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Committee met since 25 February 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 817, 833, 917, 927 and 928 of 2005.

**NO. 903 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - IBERRAIL**

What steps have Government taken to monitor how many visitors have come to Gibraltar as a result of the inclusion of Gibraltar in the Iberrail brochure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

It is difficult to quantify how many persons come to Gibraltar as a result of the inclusion of Gibraltar in the Iberrail brochure.

Feedback obtained from hotels indicate that there have been some bookings to date but the exact number is not known as hotels are unaware if guests have responded to the Iberrail brochure or not.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 903 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not possible for the Government to monitor this in their surveys or by asking the hotels to take a note of how guests actually arrive at Gibraltar?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This is why I have said that some feedback that we have obtained from hotels indicate that there have been some bookings, however, it is not an exact figure. I cannot give him an exact figure because hotels do not monitor this sort of source of their clients. In fact some customers or some guests object to giving information as to why they have come to Gibraltar, so therefore the answer is that there has been some bookings but the exact number is not known.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What is the rough or approximate number that we are talking about?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I really would not like to commit myself because it could be 50 it could be 100, I do not know is the answer. The feedback that we have had is that the hotels have said, 'yes I have had some bookings of people', but if one asks people they cannot really quantify because mainly the information is as a result of verbal interaction between the customer and the hotelier rather than a form or an actual survey that is conducted.

**NO. 904 OF 2005****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****GTB – SCHEDULED FLIGHTS**

How many flights between Gibraltar and the following airports were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis to or from:

- (a) London Gatwick;
- (b) London Heathrow;
- (c) London Luton;
- (d) Manchester

since April 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being handed over in written format. However, what I wish to add is that Gibraltar has never enjoyed as many flights as it receives today. This summer has seen an average of 123 flight arrivals per month. The number of arriving passengers is at an all time high and the final figures for air arrivals for this year are expected to be an all time record.

**Schedule to Question 904**

Flights timetabled for the period April to September 2005:

	<b>April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
London Gatwick	30	45	43	44	44	43
London Heathrow	30	31	30	31	31	30
London Luton	30	31	30	31	31	30
Manchester	17	18	17	18	18	17

There were no flight cancellations during this period.

---



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 904 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am tempted to respond to the Minister's party political broadcast, unsolicited information but there are two things which can be said to that. The first is that never has so much money been spent in the actual marketing area, and secondly, the number of destinations are still less than when they took office in 1996 when we had five, and there are still no flights to Morocco, but I will not bother to say all that.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, I am disappointed that he gets hurt when he hears some good news but I am sure that he should no longer be concerned as he normally starts his press releases when issues of this nature arise, but I am pleased the way things are progressing in this particular area and so he should be as well.

ORAL

**NO. 905 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - AIRLINES**

Can Government say whether there has been any progress in their discussions with Easy Jet and Thomson Flying to fly to and from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 906 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 906 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - AIRLINES**

Are any new airlines in discussion with the Government about flying to and from Gibraltar in addition to the two that were interested at the last Question-Time in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

There are presently no new airlines in discussion with the Government.

Discussions continue with Thompson Fly and Easy Jet, but it is not yet possible to say what their outcome will be.

**NO. 907 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – AIR TERMINAL**

Can Government say what steps have been taken to install emergency lighting at the Air Terminal for use when there is a power cut?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

This matter has been brought to the Government's attention recently and discussions have commenced with the MOD to see if it is possible to switch to the MOD electricity supply if the normal electricity supply for the Air Terminal is interrupted as a result of a power cut.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 907 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has said that this has been brought to the attention of the Government recently, is it that there used to be a back up system before and now there is not one, or is it that they just did not know this was happening?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, there has not been a back up system ever before. The only reason is that some months back we had a situation where we had some power cuts on quite a regular basis and we found that in this day and age where computers and security screening and luggage handling et cetera is all very much computerised and obviously dependent on electricity, we found that the situation could not really be allowed to continue and so we looked at the possibility of having our own alternative supply but the cost is actually quite high. So in discussions with the MOD we discussed with them the possibility of linking us up to their system and vice versa if they found themselves in a situation, and the logistics of that is currently being given consideration by the relevant technical people on either side.

ORAL

**NO. 908 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

What were the issues of co-operation, collaboration and co-ordination discussed between the Ports of Algeciras and Gibraltar in their meeting in May?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 909, 910 and 911 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 909 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

Has there been any more contact between the Port of Algeciras and Gibraltar following the meeting in May and if so when, at what level, and over what issue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 908, 910 and 911 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 910 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

Has a date been set for a meeting in Gibraltar between the Gibraltar and Algeciras Port authorities, and if so when is it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 908, 909 and 911 of 2005.

**NO. 911 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

What does the invitation extended to the Port of Gibraltar to participate in the Algeciras Port centenary celebrations in 2006 entail?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The meeting between the ports of Gibraltar and Algeciras in May 2005 was an initial meeting aimed at mapping out an agenda for a closer relationship between both ports. It was agreed that two specialist working groups be created to deal with specific issues referred to as the working groups. One working group deals with Maritime Authority issues, the other with Port Authority issues.

The May meeting did not discuss issues, it set an agenda for issues to be considered at a technical level, and for reports from the specialist working groups to be referred to the Government and the Algeciras Port Authority respectively, for further discussion at a future plenary meeting. A date for this meeting is still to be agreed.

The specialist working group met in Gibraltar on 27<sup>th</sup> September, 2005. This meeting was at the level of officials from both ports. The issues that were discussed were prevention of maritime pollution; the response to a pollution incident or a maritime accident; marketing and promotion of both ports; interchange of information on both ports; exchange of experience in relation to port infrastructure developments; and control of maritime traffic in the Bay of Gibraltar.

Insofar as the Algeciras Port centenary celebrations for 2006 are concerned, Algeciras simply indicated that it will be organising a series of events to mark its centenary and the port of Gibraltar was invited to participate in the celebration. The programme for the Algeciras centenary has yet to be finalised.



ORAL

**NO. 912 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

Have any commercial entities submitted proposals, formally or informally, for a direct ferry link between the Ports of Gibraltar and Algeciras?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 913 and 914 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 913 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

Which are the commercial entities interested in a direct ferry link between the Ports of Gibraltar and Algeciras?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 912 and 914 of 2005.

**NO. 914 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PORT OF ALGECIRAS**

Who are the “appropriate relevant authorities” to whom entities interested in a direct ferry link between Gibraltar and Algeciras have to submit proposals for consideration and approval and are any such proposals currently under consideration?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A formal proposal has been submitted to the Government for restoring an Algeciras-Gibraltar ferry service from a consortium of Gibraltar and Spanish businessmen. An informal proposal has also been made from a Gibraltar Company. It is not possible to give details of the persons expressing an interest in this possible service until formal applications are made to the Government to license the service.

The Government are the appropriate relevant authority to approve an application for the Gibraltar side of a ferry operation. It is for an intended operator to establish from the Algeciras Port Authority to whom an application needs to be submitted to obtain Spanish approval for the service.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 912 TO 914 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I understood the Minister correctly he said that a formal proposal has been submitted to the Government by Gibraltar and Spanish businessmen and there is also an informal Gibraltar proposal, can he say when these were made?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The formal proposal was submitted possibly in early summer, possibly the month of June then an informal proposal was made to me possibly during the month of August. However, even though one is formal in the sense that they wrote a proposal and actually submitted a proposal to the Government, and the other one was informal in the terms of a meeting where they said ‘I would like to look at the possibility, what do I need to do?’, nobody has yet come up with an application and said ‘I want to do this’. Therefore, that is why I am differentiating the formal and informal proposal from

the need to submit an application and we are hopeful that that will be forthcoming soon.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What indications does the Minister have that an application made to the Port of Algeciras would be considered and approved?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well from the meeting that I had with them, the indications were that they were very much in favour of re-establishing that service. However, they were clear to me that they would need clearance from Madrid in respect of the re-establishment of that maritime link. However, we are aware that they have carried out an assessment on the logistics of actually operating or allowing such a service to operate in the Port of Algeciras and they have submitted their requirements to Madrid in order for them to be fully conversant of all the facts, because obviously a ferry link between Gibraltar and Algeciras would mean that the Port of Algeciras would need to have immigration and customs et cetera available and possibly additional resources would have to be made available for the port to be able to police the service.

ORAL

**NO. 915 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT STATE CONTROL INSPECTIONS**

Can Government say how many Port State Control inspections were carried out by the Gibraltar authorities within our territorial waters in the year 2004 and in 2005 to date, providing a breakdown showing the name of the inspected vessel and the date of the inspection?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

Schedule(1) to Question 915

PSC INSPECTION OF VESSELS IN GIBRALTAR, 2004

NAME OF VESSEL	IMO No.	FLAG	INSPECTION DATE	DEFICIENCIES	DETAINED?
HERA	7017375	ST. VINCENT & GREN	31st DECEMBER 2004	YES	YES
URSUS	8100105	ST. VINCENT & GREN	22nd DECEMBER 2004	YES	NO
OCEAN BOOMER	6525131	PANAMA	30th NOVEMBER 2004	YES	YES
VERAOIL VI	8125600	MALTA	25th NOVEMBER 2004	NO	NO
HARLAN	7369168	PANAMA	13th NOVEMBER 2004	YES	YES
VERAOIL XXV	9087867	MALTA	7th NOVEMBER 2004	YES	NO
ODIN	8108121	DENMARK	1st NOVEMBER 2004	NO	NO
VERAOIL XX	9005613	MALTA	13th OCTOBER 2004	YES	NO
VERAOIL IX	8410665	MALTA	6th OCTOBER 2004	YES	NO
VAN GOGH	7359400	ST. VINCENT & GREN	26th SEPTEMBER 2004	YES	NO
VERAOIL VI	8125600	MALTA	20th SEPTEMBER 2004	YES	NO
VERABALTIC	8325066	MALTA	8th SEPTEMBER 2004	YES	NO
VERAOCEAN	8325078	MALTA	7th SEPTEMBER 2004	YES	NO
FAIAL	7521194	MONGOLIA	31st AUGUST 2004	YES	NO
PARAGON	7639827	CYPRUS	24th AUGUST 2004	YES	NO
ANGEL ACCORD	9286152	PANAMA	24th AUGUST 2004	YES	NO
CHRISTOS	7620457	GEORGIA	13th AUGUST 2004	YES	NO
NORDICA	7928627	CYPRUS	28th JULY 2004	YES	YES (BANNED)
DAPENGHAI	9251860	CHINA	21st MAY 2004	YES	YES
SUN	8220163	MALTA	21st MAY 2004	YES	NO

Cont...

Contd Answer to Question 915

ILKNUR II	7806180	TURKEY	12th MAY 2004	YES	YES (BANNED)
ELENA B	7721330	ST. VINCENT & GREN	10th MAY 2004	YES	NO
GRETA	9191747	NETHERLANDS ANTILLES	7th MAY 2004	YES	NO
HUMBOLDT CURRENT	7819943	ST. VINCENT & GREN	4th MAY 2004	YES	YES
OPDR CARTAGENA	9155432	CANARY ISLANDS	22nd APRIL 2004	YES	NO
YESIL RIZE I	7505786	TURKEY	13th APRIL 2004	YES	NO
PORTHOS	7639616	ST. VINCENT & GREN	01st APRIL 2004	YES	NO
ONEGA	9021083	RUSSIA	01st APRIL 2004	YES	NO
QUO VADIS	8314287	NETHERLANDS ANTILLES	01st APRIL 2004	YES	NO
VEMAOIL VIII	8223268	MALTA	23rd MARCH 2004	YES	YES
RADIANT JEWEL	9005211	LIBERIA	17th MARCH 2004	YES	NO
ATASOYLAR II	9001150	TURKEY	15th MARCH 2004	YES	NO
KAIROS	6908964	ST. VINCENT & GREN	19th FEBRUARY 2004	YES	NO
VEMAOIL IX	8410665	MALTA	6th FEBRUARY 2004	YES	NO
VEMAOIL XXV	9087867	MALTA	2nd FEBRUARY 2004	NO	NO

Cont...

*Contd Answer to Question 915*  
Schedule (2) to Question 915

PSC INSPECTION OF VESSELS IN GIBRALTAR, 2005

NAME OF VESSEL	IMO No.	FLAG	INSPECTION DATE	DEFICIENCIES	DETAINED?
PANGANI	9318943	ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	17-Jan-05	NO	NO
VEMAOIL XI	9036868	MALTA	24-Jan-05	YES	NO
TANGER JET	9127758	MOROCCO	04-Feb-05	YES	NO
VEMAOIL XXV	9087867	MALTA	04-Feb-05	YES	NO
DANIEL	9148104	THE NETHERLANDS	09-Feb-05	YES	NO
AMUR	8721521	RUSSIA	25-Feb-05	YES	NO
MELFI ITALIA II	9235622	ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	23-Feb-05	YES	YES (PREV.)
MAGNIFIC	9011492	THE NETHERLANDS	09-Mar-05	YES	NO
VEMAOIL VIII	8223268	MALTA	23-Mar-05	YES	NO
ROKO BAY	7427154	PANAMA	23-Mar-05	YES	NO
MIDLAND 21	8002793	MALTA	30-Mar-05	NO	NO
CATALYST	7122560	PANAMA	04-Apr-05	YES	YES
ARIANA	8710687	FRANCE	05-Apr-05	YES	NO
DINTELSTROOM	8433291	THE NETHERLANDS	15-Apr-05	YES	NO
ZEELEEUW	7416026	THE NETHERLANDS	22-Apr-05	YES	NO
ARION	6419057	PORTUGAL	13-May-05	YES	NO
CALIFORNIA	7404889	PANAMA	23-May-05	YES	YES
MONTECRUZ	7710276	PANAMA	26-May-05	YES	NO
SEA ILEX	8807208	PANAMA	13-Jun-05	YES	YES (PREV.)
GLENBANK A	7915620	MALTA	15-Jun-05	YES	NO

3

Cont...



Contd Answer to Question 915

THOMSON SPIRIT	8024014	CYPRUS	26-Jun-05	YES	NO
VEMABALTIC	8325066	MALTA	30-Jun-05	YES	NO
DRAVO COSTA BLANCA	7430943	SPAIN	06-Jul-05	YES	NO
SUMANA NAREE	8401781	THAILAND	13-Jul-05	YES	YES
SILVER STAR	7301245	PANAMA	13-Jul-05	YES	NO
SARDIUN	9080687	THE NETHERLANDS	20-Jul-05	YES	YES
VEMAOIL XV	9088108	MALTA	04-Aug-05	YES	NO
BELOMORSKIY	8305781	PORTUGAL	15-Aug-05	YES	NO
SMITWIJSLONDON	7402453	HOLLAND	25-Aug-05	YES	NO
MARITIME SUZANNE	9221023	HONG KONG	27-Aug-05	YES	NO
KRITI EMERALD	8513625	MALTA	31-Aug-05	YES	YES
SARAH ROUSING	7822495	DENMARK	07-Sep-05	YES	NO
ALPHAGAS	9130456	ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	07-Sep-05	YES	NO
REGATTA	9156474	MARSHALL ISLANDS	22-Sep-05	YES	NO

ORAL

**NO. 916 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SHIP VISITS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar since April 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis for:

- (a) bunkering;
- (b) cargo;
- (c) repairs

and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Schedule to Question 916**

The following numbers of ships called at Gibraltar since April 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis for: -

Month	Bunkering	Cargo	Repairs
April	443	2	12
May	501	1	8
June	520	1	8
July	514	2	3
August	478	1	5

The following tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month during the same period: -

Month	Bunkers Sold
April	304,484
May	370,350
June	362,596
July	349,969
August	347,698

---

ORAL

**NO. 917 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Port Advisory Council met since 11 February 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 817, 833, 902, 927 and 928 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 918 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

Have any new applications for a bunkering licence been made since the last Question-Time in this House?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

No.

ORAL

**NO. 919 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR YACHT REGISTRY**

What is the total number of yachts on the Gibraltar Yacht registry as at 31 August 2005 and can Government supply a list showing the name of each yacht?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested is set out in the attached schedule.

**Schedule to Question 919**

**LIST OF PLEASURE YACHTS**

The attached is a list of the pleasure yachts registered as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2005.

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1989056	NIÑA	715633	ZDBX9
2003054	*EUROS*	736740	ZDFV4
1996077	7 ROSES	728009	
2003051	7TH HEAVEN	736723	ZDFV2
1993010	AAA	716480	
1985071	ABY	708577	ZDAE2
1993082	AD LE FORT	723276	
2001099	ADAJE	734667	
1992073	ADHARA	720663	ZDFK2
1988123	ADRIANA OF SARK	715144	ZDBT8
1996080	ADVANTAGE	727958	
1981001	AETEA	384538	ZCWR
2005062	AGATA	GIB-0165	
2002061	AISEO	735366	ZDFF5
2005036	AISLING	GIB-0141	ZDGV4
2005046	AJOO	GIB-0153	ZDGV8
2003126	AJUGA	GIB-0030	ZDGE3
1998063	AKAI SANGO	731435	
1999048	AKIM	731488	ZDDU8
2002012	ALBATROS	735317	ZDFA7
2000076	ALBI	733638	
2004011	ALBULA	GIB-0043	ZDGF6
2004048	ALCYON	GIB-0064	ZDGI6
2000015	ALEPPO	732144	
2002137	ALEXANDER	736329	ZDFO7
1991019	ALFIE II	716486	ZDCK5
2002002	ALGE	734679	ZDEZ4
2004058	ALICE	GIB-0071	ZDGH7
1998045	ALISE	731423	
1999096	ALL THE WAY	732116	
2005082	ALLISON	GIB-0176	ZDGZ9
2004087	ALPENROSE	GIB-0100	ZDGO8
2004070	ALSIMUM	GIB-0079	ZDGK7
1995015	ALTA	724834	
2004081	AMABILE II	GIB-0078	ZDGO6
2001119	AMANDA JAYNE	734678	ZDEV6
2002028	AMARIA	735336	
2001139	AMARULA	735303	ZDEY6
1993017	AMIKARO	720692	
2003125	ANATOLIA	734044	
2001083	ANATOLIE	734643	ZDFQ7
2000061	ANDIAMO	733624	ZDEF8
2002089	ANKAA	736279	
1997087	ANNA	730125	
1983045	ANNA CATHERINA	702568	ZDTY
1996012	ANNABELLE	721936	
1989092	ANOTHER TOY	715669	

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**



**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2003129	ARCTIC PRINCESS	GIB-0027	
2002083	ARGOS	738271	ZDFI2
2004103	ARION II	GIB-0105	ZDGP9
2005085	ARKAS STAR	GIB-0168	ZDGY8
1998099	ARROGANCE	731470	ZDDR9
1990094	ART II	716122	
1997022	ASTERIX	385190	
2004021	ASTRAEA	738725	ZDGH2
1992095	ASTRIDULON	720676	ZDCU6
2004029	ASTRONESTES	GIB-0052	
2002037	ATHINA OF THE AEGEAN	735338	ZDFD8
1995090	ATLANTEAN	724766	
2001125	ATLANTIA	734888	
2002057	AURIGA	735368	
2002021	AZIYADE	735329	ZDFB9
2004112	AZZURRA	GIB-0111	ZDQG6
2003090	BA	736763	ZDFZ2
1993013	BABY ELEPHANT	723228	
1986100	BACELOT	710664	ZDAV3
2003093	BACHERA III	GIB-0002	ZDFX9
1998107	BAGHIRA	712151	
1997034	BAGUETTE OF TENBY	728012	
2005068	BAL'HA	GIB-0169	ZDGY9
1997029	BALI	728033	
1988039	BALLENA	711370	ZDBQ3
2000023	BALSAMO	732155	ZDEB7
1992037	BAMBOLETO	720612	
1997052	BAMBOULA	730119	
2002092	BARBARELLA	735379	ZDFJ4
1993032	BARCAROLE OF RHU	377799	ZDCW2
1991049	BARCHETTA	716465	ZDCM3
2004027	BARON	GIB-0055	ZDGH9
1999040	BARRAONDA	732078	
2000053	BARTON QUEEN	733613	ZDEE7
1998110	BAYOLLA	731475	ZDD57
1999106	BEAUCOUP FISH	732128	
1992079	BEEFEATER BABY	720680	
2001034	BELLA	724758	
1983112	BELLA MILENA	706864	ZDUQ
2004094	BELLA NAVETTA	GIB-0089	ZDGP8
1996069	BELLINE II	727995	ZDEP6
2005054	BEN MARIE	GIB-0148	ZDGV8
2001013	BENJAMIN	733690	ZDEL8
2002087	BERNARD	735325	ZDFI7
1999039	BERNE	732069	ZDFA2
1989106	BI-BIP	715681	ZDCQ6
1995120	BIANCA NEVE	724787	ZDEB

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1995021	BIG BLACK ONE	724836	
2005087	BIJOU	GIB-0185	
1985076	BILL	708597	ZDAE8
1996021	BINGO	727953	
2004036	BINZIYAD	903755	ZDGL3
1986113	BLACK DRAGON-FLY	710658	ZDAT4
1990111	BLACK MARLIN	716135	
2003136	BLAUCO	722554	
1999026	BLUE	731497	
1987001	BLUE BOAT	336413	
2000058	BLUE CLIPPER	733618	ZDEF2
1994033	BLUE MOON OF EAST	724770	ZDCZ8
1991030	BLUE PEGASUS	716499	
1999082	BLUE PENNANT	731499	
1997071	BLUE WATERS	730136	ZDDM9
1993037	BODY LINE	722039	
1990052	BOLD ADVENTURE	716055	
2002124	BON VIVANT	736316	ZDFN5
1998043	BON VOYAGE	726990	
2003081	BONITA	736764	ZDFX6
1998066	BOUGAINVILLE	730181	
1997086	BUCANNIERO	730144	
1994045	BUENAS NOTICIAS	724776	
1993108	BUGA	723298	
1999101	BULL	732120	
1999108	BURKANA	732127	
1996093	BYRON	728019	
2003100	C'EST LA VIE	GIB-0007	ZDFY3
2003095	CACHAÇA	900872	ZDFY8
1995105	CACOS	727007	ZDDI4
2001040	CALDERON	733671	ZDEC05
2005055	CALICO	GIB-0158	ZDGM3
2001046	CALVIN	734618	ZDEP3
1995009	CALYPSO	724806	
1981023	CAMARA	385092	ZCWS
1998030	CANITO	730177	
1997054	CAPITAINE NÉMO	730121	ZDDZ8
2005012	CAPE ROSE	GIB-0126	ZDGR5
2002084	CAPRICHIO II	736272	ZDFI3
1989072	CARA ROSITA	715639	ZDBZ2
1989082	CARELEN OF ATHENS	715602	ZDBZ9
2001061	CARMA	734627	ZDEC09
1990031	CASADOR	715632	ZDCY4
2001103	CASCU II	733663	
1989080	CASPIAN	715650	
2001080	CAT EYE	734653	
2000039	CATALINA	733605	ZDED4

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1992078	CAYUCO	720874	
2000009	CAZOU	732146	
1993106	CEDAR SEA II	710070	ZDCY7
1993011	CELANDINE	723230	ZDCV3
1986125	CHANTALOU	710696	ZDAY4
2004091	CHASEY	GIB-0104	ZDGP4
2004024	CHECHI	GIB-0048	
1993089	CHELSEA	723304	ZDDR5
1995111	CHERHEITO II	727033	ZDDH8
1989031	CHIHIO	715604	
1995008	CHOU-CHOU OF HAMBURG	724804	
1986015	CHRIS-GO	710420	ZDAK9
2001052	CHRISTIAN	734594	
1998015	CHRISTIANIA	728024	ZDFZ3
1991041	CIGON	716512	ZDCL8
1993102	CINTA	723257	
2001118	CLADITS	734681	
2000043	CLASSIC	733612	ZDED9
1996052	CLETINA	727963	
1997037	CLEVER CLIPPER	730104	ZDDL7
1993059	CLIFONEER	723278	
1995019	COCHERITO	724840	
1993081	COMMANDANT LELIEVRE	723253	
2001005	CONDOR II	733667	ZDEK8
2004096	CONFianza	GIB-0103	ZDGO7
1993060	CORAL DREAM	723268	ZDCX2
2002108	CORAL DREAMS OF GIBRALTAR	736297	
2005034	CORFU	GIB-0142	
2004097	CRIMEAN STAR	GIB-0106	ZDGM9
1995054	CROSSROADS	726970	ZDDJ3
2004062	CUCULI	GIB-0076	ZDGM7
2001065	CURIO	734634	
1997019	CYGNUS II	728020	
2000012	CYOS	718538	
2001044	D AND SEVEN	733634	ZDEP2
1991075	DANNY BOY	716543	
2001020	DARING	733599	ZDEM6
2001030	DE-JAVU	734601	ZDEN4
2001121	DEEP BLUE SEA	734685	ZDEV8
2001129	DEFIANCE	735295	ZDEW6
2000090	DESERT SNAKE	718584	ZDEI4
2003128	DESERT STAR	GIB-0031	ZDGC7
2004032	DESTINY	GIB-0049	ZDGG6
2002112	DI TERRA	736277	ZDFL6
1995078	DILARA UNO	726946	
1996089	DIVA	728017	ZDDL5
2005088	DJADO III	GIB-0184	

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

# **LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2001127	DON ESTEBAN II	735292	ZDEW3
2002093	DORIS	735322	ZDFJ5
2002052	DRAGONFLY OF GIBRALTAR	735350	ZDFF4
1983056	DRAKKAR	702571	ZDUI
2003067	DREAM CHASER	736755	ZDFV3
1995052	DREAMLINK	726958	ZDDE9
1998064	DREAMTIME	731433	ZDDQ8
1991014	DREAMWAVE	716492	ZDCJ8
1991025	DRIFTER	716495	ZDCK9
1988074	DUCKY DUCK	715106	ZDBQ6
1983052	DURLINDANA	702560	ZDRD
1995075	EIRMAR IV	726972	
2004008	EL CONDOR	GIB-0042	ZDGF2
1978020	EL PATO	373615	ZDHW
1993087	ELEPHANT	723294	
2004010	ELEUTHERA	GIB-0028	ZDGA8
2002130	ELLIE ACTUALLY	736323	ZDFO4
1982023	EMERALUDE	399738	ZDOF
2004068	EMMA	GIB-0084	ZDGM2
1992027	ENANIT	720635	ZDES3
2001026	ENTERPRISE	734593	ZDEO7
1998009	EPERONA	730168	
2005050	EQUALITY	GIB-0143	ZDGW7
1999060	EQUATEUR IX	732086	
2003124	EQUILIBRIUM	GIB-0011	ZDFZ7
2005003	ESPRITE	GIB-0119	ZDGS6
1997031	ESTRELLA	730099	
2002065	ETAMIN STAR	735374	ZDFG5
2001075	ETESIAN	734645	ZDET7
1999100	ETOILE DE MERS	732124	
2003035	EXILE	736721	
1999109	EXILTANTE	732129	ZDEI8
2005064	EXPRESSION II	GIB-0167	ZDGW6
1994070	FAIRY	724811	ZDDB5
1981015	FALCON OF HORNET	385096	
1997038	FANCY NANCY	730102	
1971009	FARAD	343893	ZCWG
1999097	FARR AWAY	732115	
1999080	FARR NIENTE	732104	ZDDW6
1999086	FEARLESS	732109	
2003012	FEDERISH	736347	ZDFQ8
2000011	FELICITA 1	732135	ZDEA6
1985102	FERONIA	708602	ZDAH7
2003068	FIDEL	736746	ZDFW4
2003098	FLEMINGO	GIB-0010	ZDGC4
2002101	FLY	736291	ZDFK4
2001132	FLYING FOX	734683	ZDEX2

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

# **LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1989112	FLYING LADY	716044	ZDCC2
1999004	FOOTLOOSE	731474	ZDDU5
2005045	FOOTLOOSE & FANCY FREE	GIB-0118	
1993050	FOR ME	723265	ZDCX3
2000021	FOR THE GOOD TIMES	732153	ZDEB6
1998056	FOUR SISTERS	730187	
1995068	FRANCE	726982	ZDDZ2
2000088	FRANZ TOO	733654	ZDEI2
1997025	FREE BORN	708776	
2000001	FREE SPIRIT	732071	ZDDY9
1998073	FREEDOM	731438	ZDDR3
1996062	FREELANCE II	727993	
2002119	FREEWHEEL	736306	ZDFN7
2003122	FULL MOON	GIB-0025	ZDGB9
1999050	FULL MOON LADY	732081	
1999065	FURY	732089	
2002006	FYN	727773	
1996029	G CURCI	722079	
2001050	G. CINQUANTA	733650	
1998026	G.A.N.T.	730184	
1999068	GALAPAGO	732094	ZDEP6
1989113	GALAXSEA NOVA	716041	
2002001	GALAXY	734686	ZDEZ3
2000062	GERON	732100	
2000052	GENISTA	733616	
1983113	GEOPAR II	706867	ZEPL
1998083	GETSMART	731458	
1992017	GIBCATCH	720605	
1979020	GIBRALTAR TADPOLE	373610	
2003116	GIO	GIB-0020	ZDGB5
2004057	GLENHEATH	GIB-0074	ZDGL6
1996091	GLORIA OF GRENADA	728014	ZDDN4
2003080	GO	736782	ZDFX4
1991053	GOD'S BEAUTY	716525	ZDDS9
2000026	GOLDOR	733595	ZDEC2
1998016	GRAIN DE SEL	730164	
2005085	GRAND CRU	GIB-0177	ZDGB5
1984105	GRAND GOUSIER	708355	ZETP
1993027	GRAND JACQUES	720618	ZDCV6
1997101	GREAT WHITE	719299	ZDDO5
1995066	GREEN TURTLE	726974	ZDDF3
2001063	GUERNSEY ROSE	734620	
2002100	GUERRILLA TRADER	736289	
1997064	GWENDALINA DIII	730130	
1995028	HAM SURVEY	308126	
1991064	HAMOR	716537	
1995097	HANNAH ROSE	727018	ZDDY2

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1993077	HAPPY DAZE	723299	ZDCX5
2005040	HAPPY HOUR	GIB-0147	ZDGV3
2005038	HAPPY MOLLY II	GIB-0145	ZDGU6
2004063	HEAVEN	GIB-0082	ZDGM8
2004078	HEAVEN CAN WAIT	GIB-0085	ZDGN6
1999014	HELIOS-RE	731491	
2001110	HENNY	708607	
1996047	HERMIT	727983	
1985055	HESPERIA PRIMA	708575	ZDAC3
2002054	HOA	735344	
1998077	HOUSTON	731455	ZDDR4
2004065	HUSH HUSH	GIB-0072	ZDGM5
1998078	ICEBERG	731444	
1995106	ILIOS	727026	ZDDH7
1993036	IMHABBA	723248	ZDEK7
1990068	INDEPENDENCE	716107	ZDCF6
1989108	INDIAN	715655	
1980005	INVICTA	384502	ZDPR
1985078	IOANNA A	708587	ZDAF3
2001048	IRRATIONAL EXUBERANCE	734616	ZDEP5
1997085	ITACO	730145	
1999089	IWI	732061	
1988043	JACKELLA	711362	ZDBR4
2005028	JAGANAR	GIB-0137	ZDGU2
2004073	JALAN JALAN	GIB-0075	ZDGL4
2004042	JAMAI	GIB-0067	ZDGJ2
2003077	JAMES COOK	736741	ZDFU6
2005066	JANNIXA	GIB-0146	ZDGV6
2003092	JANTAR	GIB-0008	ZDFZ5
2005053	JARK	GIB-0155	ZDGR7
1992020	JASON	720625	ZDCQ2
1993023	JAVAN	723247	
2001134	JAWARI	734690	ZDEX9
1990048	JEK	716074	ZDCE8
2003083	JENA-ROSE	736766	
2000049	JOACHIM	733604	ZDEE8
1992039	JODIE	720656	ZDCR2
2005051	JOELLE II	GIB-0152	ZDGW9
2003032	JOHANNA	736368	ZDFS8
1981094	JOIE DE VIVRE	399624	ZDJF
2002075	JOLLY WORLD	735372	ZDFH6
2000087	JOVIC	733652	ZDEH9
1990106	JOY GING	716451	ZDCH4
1999087	JUANJO	732102	
1983090	JULIA AF FAABORG	702576	ZDWO
1998046	JULIA M	731424	ZDCQ2
2004082	K SERA SERA	GIB-0096	

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1991080	KAMALA	720803	ZDCC9
1997014	KAOS	727945	ZDDN8
2005083	KARDIN	GIB-0180	ZDHA2
2002058	KARIN	735359	
1980017	KARREK VEN	384529	ZDAI9
1999111	KATINKA	732132	
2001042	KC'S DREAM	734607	ZDEO8
2005017	KEMBUSQUIN	GIB-0130	ZDGT5
1988071	KERKYRA	710870	ZDBQ7
2002066	KIKIRIKI	735375	ZDFG7
2001115	KIMOSABI	734680	ZDEV4
2005030	KINGFISHER	GIB-0135	
2004046	KLOSTERS	GIB-0066	ZDGJ5
1993074	KOBOLD	723295	
1985082	KODI	708600	ZDAF6
1988045	KOJAK	711388	ZDBO3
1997081	KONTEA	730140	
2003133	KORALLE	GIB-0032	ZDGC6
2005060	KRISTIN	GIB-0164	ZDGX9
1998032	KROBY	730189	
2005081	KUMAK II	GIB-0179	
2001091	KUNDUN II	734658	
1993003	KWESEL	723224	
2003059	L'ESPRIT DU VIGNE MALE	736750	ZDFV8
2001111	L'INCONNU	734671	
2001100	LA DESIRADE III	734666	ZDEU3
1999075	LA GAVIOTA OF SKYE	732073	
1999099	LA GITANE	378294	
1992087	LA GOULUE	720689	
2001116	LA LEGION	734682	ZDEV5
1991071	LA LISA	716538	ZDCN4
2004020	LA MYETTE	GIB-0044	
1998031	LA NIÑA TONTA	730186	
1997012	LA PRIME	728035	ZDDL3
2005057	LA PRIMERA	GIB-0158	
2000089	LA RONDINE	733651	ZDEI3
2001131	LA SOIRÉE	705989	ZDEW9
1983061	LA TAOS BRETT	308715	ZDUN
1999022	LA VILAINE	731501	ZDDT6
2004054	LA VOGLIA OF SARK	715126	
2002144	LABAMBALA	736327	
2004038	LADY ANNE IV	GIB-0060	ZDEA8
1986069	LADY CREOLE	710458	ZDAR8
2003097	LADY D.	736735	ZDFZ6
2002126	LADY DOLORES II	736325	ZDFO2
2003025	LADY FLO	736363	ZDFS6
2002009	LADY KIS	711590	ZDFA5

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2000046	LADY M OF THE SEA	733611	ZDEE4
1998072	LADY MARELLA	731449	
2003102	LADY MICHELLE	GIB-0015	
2001082	LADY NATALIE	734648	ZDES9
1998062	LADY NEVINE	731443	ZDQ6
2004030	LADY OF NJORD	GIB-0058	
2002014	LADY P	735315	ZDFA8
2000059	LADY ROSE	733622	ZDEF4
2005093	LADY SPRING	734373	ZDHB3
2002123	LADY SUN	735337	ZDFM7
1989086	LADYNU	715631	ZDCA5
1996037	LAGUNA	727969	
1990045	LAKKA IV	363796	
1999057	LAMARIE	732084	ZDDV7
1997021	LAUREN H	728037	
1999069	LE DODO	732082	
2003050	LEAMAR	736738	ZDFU9
2001109	LEENA	734676	ZDEU9
2004018	LEONARDO	GIB-0045	ZDGF9
1998109	LEOPARD	731471	
1993004	LERIKA	723220	ZDCU9
1971017	LEVANTE	343900	ZDAY
1988107	LIA DE BAHIA	711348	ZDBJ8
2003071	LIBRA	736745	ZDFV6
1995086	LIGHT ME	726999	ZDGB7
2001144	LINAKA	735308	ZDEZ2
1993042	LINARYAH	723252	ZDCW5
1998086	LINE CARVER	731464	
2004095	LIQUID ROCK	GIB-0102	ZDGP2
1995059	LISMORE	300115	ZDDF4
1999041	LITTLE ONE	388023	ZDDV5
1993053	LIVET	723269	
2001062	LIZ	734632	ZDER2
2005091	LOLA E	GIB-0186	ZDHA4
2004066	LOOK OUT	GIB-0080	ZDGL9
2003011	LOOSE GOOSE	736344	
1986068	LORD JIM	365479	ZDAR7
1996010	LORENA	726965	
1997056	LOS CÉFIROS	730103	
2001058	LOUIE	734626	ZDEQ7
1999079	LOUIS-THEODORE	732090	
2005076	LOW PROFILE	GIB-0174	
2004071	LUCE	GIB-0081	
2000020	LUCIANA	732136	ZDEB8
1999088	LUCITA	732112	
2003069	LUCKY STRIKE	736757	ZDFX2
1994007	LUKEFO	724742	ZDCY9

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**



# **LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1994038	MACTONY	724763	ZDDA5
1998038	MADAME Y	716463	
1993001	MAEVA CHIQUI	723218	
2000054	MAEVA STAR II	713982	ZDEE8
1991061	MAFFY BLUE	716531	ZDDA4
1981037	MAFIGA	335332	
2004072	MAGGIE MAE	GIB-0087	ZDGN8
1997044	MAGIC I	730109	
2003058	MAGNUM MARINE	736748	
2000010	MAHUINI	901835	ZDEA5
2000033	MAIA	732151	
2003005	MALDIMARE	736301	ZDFP9
1996081	MALIN	728011	ZDDK2
1991051	MAMA MIA	716517	ZDCM4
1996065	MAMA TEINA	360783	
1998084	MANA	731461	
2002085	MANGU	735390	ZDFI4
2003072	MANUNU	736754	ZDFW7
1974017	MARAITE	356362	
1998089	MARASQUENO II	731431	ZDER7
2000107	MARCO POLO II	733627	ZDEK5
2002103	MAREN DI PONZA	736284	ZDFK6
1991047	MARIA ANNA	716516	ZDCN3
2002035	MARIGOT BLUE	735318	ZDFC7
2001014	MARLYN - GXF	377825	ZDEY4
1985041	MARMIC	708398	ZDAA7
1981060	MARSCHALLIN	399603	ZDET
1980010	MARTA P	384516	ZDPX
2002018	MARTINE	735314	ZDFB5
2005070	MARY	GIB-0166	ZDGY6
2001047	MARY-ELIZA	734813	ZDEP4
1998092	MARZAKA	710443	
1997043	MAS	358121	ZDDL9
1991042	MASSANA	386765	
2002032	MASTERCAT	735339	
2005080	MATCH ONE	GIB-0178	ZDGZ7
1998022	MAVANA	730159	ZDDP6
2002078	MAXIMUS	735387	
1996070	MAYFAIR	727999	ZDDI9
1998059	MAZBAC	727985	ZDDJ8
1992044	MCLAREN	720654	
1999007	ME-LISSA	731485	
2001114	MEDITERRANEAN PEARL	734677	
1998085	MEDIUM RARE	731463	
1993009	MEHDI III	720687	
2004092	MELINA B	GIB-0068	ZDGJ3
1994014	MENISCO ROTO	724756	

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2002142	MERMAIDS WHISPER	736332	
1989077	MESHACH	715136	ZDBZ5
2003048	METHESIS	736728	ZDFU8
1989089	MIDNIGHT MERLIN	715670	
1998097	MIDNIGHT STROLLER	731466	
1998060	MIDNIGHT SUN I	731427	
2000027	MIKADO OF SARK	399126	ZDEC3
2004023	MIKRI MARIANNA	GIB-0047	ZDGH3
2004052	MILMAR	718913	ZDGH8
1995018	MINICO	724810	ZDDD9
2005002	MISS ANNA II	GIB-0120	ZDGS8
2001117	MISSION 2 B	734872	
1998019	MISTRAL	730175	
1986083	MISTRAL BLUE	710665	ZDAT7
1993012	MISTY SEA	723235	
2005056	MIT SAR	GIB-0159	ZDGX4
1997059	MONA	730126	
1997082	MONA LISA	730143	ZDDR7
2003057	MONTANA	736724	ZDFV7
1995049	MOONBEAM	726956	ZDDE5
2004093	MOONDANCE	GIB-0094	ZDQG8
2004040	MOONSHINE	GIB - 0062	ZDGI9
2005039	MOUN	GIB-0098	
1999062	MOZART	732091	
2002102	MULTI PARTNERS	736293	ZDFK5
2003042	MY ISLAND	736730	ZDGG8
2000019	MY SUNFISH	732154	ZDEB3
2000092	MYDREAMS	901503	ZDEI5
1981008	N.P.TUNA	385093	ZDBM
2005072	NADIR A	GIB-0171	ZDGY2
1987018	NADS	710844	ZDBA9
2003064	NAFSIKA	736747	ZDFW8
1997069	NAGUAL	730134	
1996090	NAIADE	728018	ZDDK6
1999059	NAIVASHA	732088	
2005077	NAMOUSA VIII	GIB-0175	ZDGZ4
1997098	NARMM.B	730158	ZDDO8
1999049	NASVA	731456	
2005014	NATALIA	GIB-0127	ZDGT3
1996007	NATHAPE	727037	ZDFR7
2003043	NAUSIKAA	736732	
1996076	NAUTICUS	727960	
2003076	NAUTIQUE	736370	
2005073	NAUTIS	GIB-0170	ZDGZ3
1990012	NAUTY 40'S	715686	ZDCC7
1990022	NAVY GUYS	716050	
2004074	NAZCA	GIB-0073	ZDGK2

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

# **LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1993064	NEEVEEN VI	723280	ZDGG9
2004104	NEPTUNE	GIB-0093	ZDGC3
1998051	NEWPORT	731429	ZDDC3
1983096	NIBAMA II	706859	ZDWW
2002076	NIC NAC	735385	
2004043	NICE 'N' EASY	GIB-0061	ZDGJ9
1996005	NIMO	727039	
1998081	NIRIIS	731442	
2004013	NO PROBLEM	GIB-0036	ZDGD7
2004037	NO SMOKER	GIB-0059	ZDGX3
2000048	NOKI	733614	ZDEE5
1999076	NOMAD	379057	
1998021	NON STOP	730165	
1985073	NORDLYSET	708589	ZDAE4
1994084	NOUNOUCHE	724786	
1991050	NUNU III	716514	
2001004	OCEAN DREAMS	733678	
2001130	OCEAN LADY	735294	ZDEW7
2004067	OCEAN ODYSSEY	GIB-0086	ZDGM6
2004085	OCEAN OF LOVE	GIB-0091	ZDGJ7
2005084	OCEAN OF PEACE	GIB-0083	ZDGZ8
1991023	OCEAN REALITY	716481	ZDFS4
1993070	OCTOPUSSY	723254	
2004102	OFF THE HOOK	GIB-0108	ZDGM3
2004098	OFF THE HOOK II	GIB-0092	ZDGM4
1998079	OKEY	731452	
2005044	OLA	GIB-0151	
1995081	OLD SAM	726989	
2001033	OLYMPIA	734602	
2004049	ONCE MORE	GIB-0069	
2003062	ONE 4 US	736752	ZDFW6
1992101	ONLY NOMANIE	720894	ZDCW4
2002072	ORP A LOT	735384	
1995057	OSAN-MOE	726977	
1982043	PACIFIC	399717	ZDQA
2002008	PALADIN	724830	
2003113	PAM EXPRESS	717620	ZDGI3
1995112	PANDORA II	727005	
2001085	PAPILLON	734652	ZDET2
1985072	PARIS A	708586	ZDAE3
2003009	PATEKA	736345	
1997096	PATJY II	730146	
2004118	PATO	GIB-0117	ZDGS3
1995008	PATOYOU	724829	
2001105	PAVANNE	734641	ZDEU6
2000031	PAX ROMANA	733598	ZDEC5
1993043	PEARL OF SEA MORE	723250	ZDCW6

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

# **LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1998097	PENELOPE	373138	ZDEE3
1988075	PERLA BIANCA	377127	ZDBP4
2003112	PERSISTENT	GIB-0014	ZDGA2
1989107	PESCE	715614	ZDCB8
1999037	PETALINA	732068	
1999070	PETER PAN	732085	ZDDV9
2003055	PHAEDRE	736743	ZDFV5
1999033	PHILOFAST	731489	
1998057	PHILYOMAR III	731419	
2000025	PICKLE OF THE ROCK	733596	ZDEB9
1988088	PICKWICK	715105	ZDBR6
1982013	PINEAPPLE	399715	
2003007	PINK CHAMPAGNE	736334	ZDFQ4
1993095	PINTA DEL SUR	723307	
2005089	PIXI & DIXI	GIB-0183	
2003038	PLANADO	736299	ZDFT7
1997009	POKER I	714377	ZDCZ9
2004047	POLARIS	GIB-0065	ZDGI5
1976043	POLITA II	373217	ZDFK
1994047	PONGO	724774	ZDDA8
1998040	POSEIDON	731417	ZDDQ4
2004017	PRINCESS AYESHA	712430	ZDGF8
1988093	PRINCESS ELAYNE	710653	ZDAU4
1991021	PRINCESSE YANOUSHKA	716470	
2000041	PRINCIPESSA	732157	ZDED8
1997060	PRIVILEGE V	730128	ZDDM6
2001138	PROGRESSION	735306	ZDEY5
1998007	PROLIFIC OSPREY	730149	
2004115	PROPOSITION	724817	
1999085	PROTOTYPE	732108	
1989002	PULSAR UN	715133	
2004002	PYXIS	GIB-0004	ZDGE9
1999044	QUEST	732072	
1995079	RA'I ATEA	726996	ZDDG6
2002051	RACHEL CHRISTINA	735357	ZDFF2
1983058	RACHELE	702332	ZDUK
2000014	RACLETTE	732139	ZDEA9
1999043	RADHA	732074	
2003138	RAIKA	GIB-0024	
2004039	RAMBUS	734342	ZDGH4
1998076	RAPA NUI	731454	ZDDS8
1994074	RATBAG II	724794	ZDDB7
2005008	RAW PRAWN	GIB-0122	ZDHA3
1997049	REBELDE	730108	
1992026	RED ANGELINA	720634	
2000102	RED PEPPER	733661	ZDEJ8
1983029	REGINA CAELIS	702313	ZDSU

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2003134	RESCATOR	GIB-0034	ZDGC9
1990005	RICSAN CREST	703209	
2004105	RIVERBEN	726389	ZDGL2
1988073	ROCIO	710654	ZDAS7
1990127	ROMANCES	716459	ZDCI7
2004113	ROOSTER	GIB-0114	
2003075	ROSES DE COEUR	736759	
1996096	ROSINA	728021	
1996017	ROTUMA	727951	ZDDX6
1994078	RSR	716932	ZDDB8
1997062	RUACH	730123	ZDDN3
1981053	RUBY'S RASCAL	360604	ZDEF
2003103	RUSALKA	731118	ZDFY9
1995025	RUSSE NOIR	724820	
1984029	SAGARTXO III	708212	ZEOP
1998011	SAGITARIUS	730171	
2004101	SAINT-POURÇAIN	736340	ZDFP8
2001140	SALAMAT	722279	ZDEY8
1998013	SALEM	730173	ZDDP3
1991046	SALEVA	716508	
2002034	SALOMON	735340	ZDFA3
1983053	SAMARANG	702549	ZDUG
2000060	SAMARANG II	733626	ZDEF7
2002118	SAMATHA	736305	ZDFM3
2003019	SAMIOPOULA	736351	ZDFR4
2001053	SAN FRANCISCO	734610	ZDEP8
1995064	SAN MARTIN	723261	
2003070	SAN PEDRO	736756	ZDGB4
1988053	SAPPHIRE	397900	ZDBP3
1997058	SARA	730122	ZDDM5
1992098	SARABINA	720696	
2005092	SARATOGA	717358	ZDHB5
1997080	SARAVA	730142	
1997063	SARAY	730098	
2002011	SAYONARA	735302	ZDFA6
1993063	SCAMPOLO	723258	
1998043	SCARABAJO	731422	
1996060	SCARLETT GRACE	727992	
1986005	SCORPIOS	708624	ZDAJ7
1986006	SCORPIOS II	708625	ZDAJ8
1986008	SCORPIOS IV	708627	ZDAK2
1986013	SCORPIOS IX	710402	ZDAK7
1986009	SCORPIOS V	708628	ZDAK3
1986010	SCORPIOS VI	708629	ZDAK4
1986011	SCORPIOS VII	708630	ZDAK5
1986012	SCORPIOS VIII	710401	ZDAK6
1986014	SCORPIOS X	710403	ZDAK8

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2003037	SEA HARMONY	735351	
2004114	SEA JAY	GIB-0113	ZDGR2
1999010	SEA SAM	712056	
1998087	SEAHAWK	731460	ZDDR6
2005069	SEAHORSE	GIB-0161	ZDGX6
2002122	SEARENITY	736311	ZDFM6
1995055	SEE U LATER SWITZERLAND	726967	ZDDP2
2002050	SENATOR CRU	735345	ZDFE9
1998055	SENSATION	731432	ZDDQ5
1997020	SENTA	728039	ZDDL4
1998039	SERAPH	731420	ZDDP8
2003033	SERENA	384966	
2000100	SERENE	732152	ZDEJ7
2004008	SERENITY	GIB-0038	ZDGE2
1988100	SETNA	715138	ZDBS6
2005049	SHADOWFAX	GIB-0154	ZDGK8
2000040	SHALIMAR	733602	ZDED5
2005074	SHAMWARI	GIB-0172	ZDGY5
1990097	SHIRIAN	716115	
1973018	SHOOTIN' THE BREEZE	356169	ZDKD
1983064	SIBELLE II	702572	ZDUR
1991045	SILVER FROG	716458	
1990079	SILVERLOVE	716106	ZDGV5
2000067	SIMBA	733635	ZDEG3
2002044	SIMPLY BRILLIANT	723591	
2000056	SKIJAN	733619	
2005020	SKOOKUM	GIB-0131	
2005075	SKY BLUE	GIB-0099	
1994069	SLEEPER	387508	
1987060	SLY PUSS	710904	ZDCM2
1988108	SNEP	715107	ZDBT3
2005005	SNOW DROP OF GIBRALTAR	GIB-0121	
2003039	SOLEA	736298	ZDFT8
2001003	SOLITAIRE	733677	
2002016	SOLTANA	735320	ZDFA9
2003060	SOÑADOR	736749	ZDFW3
1987066	SPARTAN A	710880	ZDBF4
1998052	SPECTRA OF BENALMADINA	706576	
2003030	SPIDERWEB II	736365	ZDFT2
1990088	SPIRIT OF ANNA MARIA	716079	
2001064	SPIRIT OF AQUARIUS	734633	ZDER3
2000086	SPIRIT OF HOPE	733645	ZDGN3
1993015	SPIRIT OF LA BAMBA	716621	
1998011	SPIRIT OF VAYU DOOT	727031	
1989038	SPITZBUBE	715176	ZDBW8
2003114	STAINLESS	GIB-0021	
1998036	STARGAZER	727971	

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
1997100	STARLIGHT EXPRESS	730160	ZDDO4
1991016	STAY LUCKY	716493	ZDCK3
2002113	STELLAR OF GIBRALTAR	736304	ZDFL7
1984061	STEPHAN	708233	ZERV
1998049	STRIPPTEASE	731426	
1992080	STRUTON	720678	ZDCU2
2003020	SUEÑO IV	736354	ZDFR6
1999084	SUMBISH	732099	
1992085	SUMMERTIME BLUES	720691	ZDCU4
2001077	SUNAMI	734609	ZDES4
1994075	SUNARROW	724795	
2001120	SUNDAY II	729499	ZDEV7
1993026	SUNPHIL LLL	723242	
1982019	SUNSPRAY	317952	ZDOC
1989114	SURFY	715675	
2001113	SURPRISE	734670	ZDEV3
2003091	SUSAN	GIB-0009	
2003105	SUSANNAH	GIB-0017	
1994054	SUTHERSEA	715697	
2002022	SUVRETTA III	735330	
1990064	SUZY Q	716105	ZDCF3
2003036	SWIFT GIBRALTAR	736355	ZDFT4
2005043	SYNERGY	GIB-0149	ZDGV7
1998105	T.J. SUNSHINE	731467	ZDDS4
2001057	T.N.T.T	733617	ZDEQ6
2005015	T/T KLOSTERS	GIB-0128	ZDGS7
2001088	TABARIYA	734659	ZDET4
2002074	TAMAM	735381	ZDFH4
2000098	TAMATA	733659	ZDEJ5
2001028	TAN TAN	733675	ZDEN3
1996001	TAOS	727022	ZDDH4
2005018	TARTIFLETTE	GIB-0129	ZDGT6
2001096	TATU	734665	ZDEU2
2001018	TAYA	733685	ZDEM4
2005033	TEMPTATION	GIB-0136	ZDGU9
2004079	TERRIFIC	GIB-0097	ZDGO4
1999112	THE JOKER	732133	
2003052	THE MOUSE	736742	ZDFU7
1998075	THE RETREAT	373009	ZDEQ8
2003028	THE ROCK	736369	ZDFS9
1982077	THEOMITOR	359163	ZERM
1980002	THIS ONE	384513	ZDCW3
2005009	THOROUGH-BRED	GIB-0124	
1995099	THREE NAILS	727008	ZDDH3
2004025	TIARÉ	GIB-0051	ZDGH6
2000066	TIDE	733628	ZDEG2
2004100	TIMAIOS III	GIB-0107	ZDGP6

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2001041	TIME FLIES	734612	ZDE08
2001043	TIME OUT	734617	ZDE09
1997053	TIMELESS	730120	ZDD08
1994050	TIMOTHY	724783	
2004012	TINTO DE VERANO	GIB-0037	ZDGD8
1990034	TOBA	716071	ZDEX8
2003137	TOGO	GIB-0035	
1988081	TOI ET MOI	715111	ZDBP6
1999052	TORJAN	732077	
1999081	TOUKY	732105	ZDDX7
1999029	TRESIA I	731508	
1999095	TROPICS	732107	
1995010	TRUDY IV	724815	
2005021	TRUMPETER OF THE ROCK	728462	
1999074	TUBINGEN	732087	ZDDW5
2003010	TUNA FISHER	736343	
1997097	TURQUOISE DREAMS	730157	ZDDP5
2005031	TUTTI COLORI	GIB-0138	ZDGU7
1992043	TWO	720658	
2004035	TWO FORTY SEVEN	728217	ZDGI2
1997036	TZAR	730100	
2004099	UNREPENTANT	901103	ZDGP7
1991009	US TWO	716477	
2002110	VAGABOND PRINCE	736303	ZDFL4
2003087	VALYUSHA	GIB-0001	ZDFY2
2002067	VANESSA STAR II	735376	ZDFG8
2004078	VANILA	GIB-0095	ZDGR6
1988042	VAYU	711384	ZDBN9
2003094	VEGERA	907640	ZDFZ4
2001081	VENI, VIDI, VICI	734650	ZDES8
1985030	VENUS-STAR	708392	ZELX
2001032	VENUTAR	733684	ZDEN7
2005019	VICTORIANA	GIB-0125	ZDGR6
2003026	VIKING	736346	ZDCM5
1990084	VINLAND	716114	ZDCJ6
1987061	VINTAN	710908	ZDBE8
2005086	VITÓRIA	GIB-0181	ZDGZ2
2005029	VIVE LA VIE	GIB-0139	ZDGX7
1977014	VIVILENA	373305	ZDGP
2001019	WAGGIS	734591	
1997007	WATOO	728028	ZDET6
1998036	WELL DONE	731412	
1995048	WET LIZARD	726960	
1985101	WETNOSE	708616	ZDAH6
1998094	WHITE ARROW	727364	
1987055	WHITE FRIAR	386412	
2002031	WHITE MOON	716137	

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**



# **LIST OF ACTIVE PLEASURE YACHTS AS AT 31/08/05**

Port_Number	Name	Official_Number	Signal_Letters
2004055	WICKED TOO	GIB-0053	
1991001	WICKED WAY	716076	
2001001	WIKANI	733672	ZDEK6
2001073	WILD SALMON	734635	ZDES2
1989017	WILLIE PICCONE	715608	ZDBZ4
2004086	WINDANCER	GIB-0090	ZDGI8
1989001	WINDPOCKE	715159	ZDBV4
2003066	WINDY-DRACO	736733	ZDFW9
1997066	WINGS OF FREEDOM	730117	
1999008	WIZARD	731479	ZDDT4
1984038	WOODFIELD II	708220	ZEQX
1995026	WURTH	726942	ZDDC9
1999098	WYLY WAY	732119	
1994023	XENIOS	724757	ZDDD6
1997091	XTASEA	726994	ZDEJ4
2004061	Y-KNOT	731507	ZDGW4
1997041	YAKAMOZ	730107	
2003082	YAMILOU VII	736753	ZDGA4
2002088	YOLANDA JOSE	736276	
2001128	YOTO III	735291	ZDEW5
2005090	YOULIA	GIB-0182	ZDGZ5
1998098	ZAIDA	731430	
1997039	ZANTAC	730105	ZDDL8
2002080	ZAURAQ	735389	ZDFH9
1982015	ZED	399736	ZDOA
2003084	ZENEIZE	736767	ZDFX8
1992030	ZORA II OF PALMARES	720643	
1996057	ZORRO	723753	ZDDY6
2004084	ZULU BRAVO	GIB-0101	ZDGJ6

**TOTAL NUMBER OF VESSELS : 828**

**NO. 920 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS - COMPUTERS**

What was the value and number of computer items imported into Gibraltar since March 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The value of computer hardware imported into Gibraltar on a monthly basis since March 2005 was as follows:

	<b>Value of Computers (£)</b>
<b>March 2005</b>	300,947
<b>April 2005</b>	339,242
<b>May 2005</b>	362,960
<b>June 2005</b>	257,364
<b>July 2005</b>	579,457
<b>August 2005</b>	425,277

Government are unable to provide a figure for the number of computers imported into Gibraltar as it is the individual components that are imported and not fully assembled computers.

The Government do not have figures for the number of computer items.

**NO. 921 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOBACCO LICENCES**

Can Government state how many licences for trading in tobacco were extant in each year since 2000 to date giving a breakdown between retail and wholesale licences?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The number of licences for trading in tobacco are as follows:-

	<u>Wholesale</u>	<u>Retail</u>
2000	18	193
2001	17	179
2002	16	178
2003	16	171
2004	17	169
2005	21	161

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 921 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There was a directive issued to the Trade Licensing Authority in the days when his predecessor, Mr Azopardi as I recall, where no more licences were being issued to trade in tobacco, no more wholesale licences. The number of wholesale licences has now gone up, has there been a change in policy?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, there has not been a change of policy but there have been circumstances when the Trade Licensing Authority has had to give consideration to applications which have made them take the decision to grant licences.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister expand on what these considerations are?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not know whether it is appropriate for me to comment on decisions of the Trade Licensing Authority. The Government have the ability to be able to inform the Trade Licensing Authority of Government policy but at the end of the day it is a statutory body which has to consider its decisions based on circumstances. I can tell him that I can at least recall one circumstance, one situation where the granting of an additional licence was something that I thought was a reasonable decision to take and therefore meant an additional licence, but the policy of the Government has not changed in this respect.

**ORAL**

**NO. 922 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of goods vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers

on a monthly basis since March 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 923 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 923 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of private motor vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers

on a monthly basis since March 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested is set out in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 923****Schedule to Question 922**

	Goods vehicles imported by individuals		Goods vehicles imported by licensed dealers	
	Number	Value (£ thousands)	Number	Value (£ thousands)
March 2005	-	-	10	34
April 2005	1	1	5	29
May 2005	2	11	5	35
June 2005	2	1	4	8
July 2005	3	9	4	14
August 2005	3	10	1	6

**Schedule to Question 923**

	Private motor vehicles imported by individuals		Private motor vehicles imported by licensed dealers	
	Number	Value (£ thousands)	Number	Value (£ millions)
March 2005	18	44.4	535	6.9
April 2005	24	102.8	567	6.3
May 2005	22	40.9	480	6.4
June 2005	25	67.0	496	5.9
July 2005	15	45.2	447	6.6
August 2005	39	120.2	459	4.8

ORAL

**NO. 924 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – BUILDING MATERIALS**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since April 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 925 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 925 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from April 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 925**

**Schedule to Question 924**

The amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since April 2005 inclusive is as follows:-

<u>2005</u>	<u>£</u>
April	31,140
May	36,150
June	62,768
July	75,815
August	72,913
September	174,865

**Schedule to Question 925**

The import duty collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from April 2005 inclusive, is as follows:-

<u>2005</u>	<u>£</u>
April	14,803
May	16,453
June	15,235
July	13,119
August	14,732
September	12,111

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 924 AND 925 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There is a huge rise in the import duty paid on building materials in September, can the Minister identify the reason for this?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I assume that there have been more building materials imported in the month of September.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Yes, but other than the obvious is it a particular project?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I am not aware of any particular reason why this should be the case. I can only assume it is to do with what I have just said, more materials must have been imported during that month.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the materials imported for land reclamation will pay import duty?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I was just thinking that myself actually because I was trying to see whether there is an explanation. I know that there has been quite a substantial amount of activity in building materials with the Island Project so that may well justify. I would assume that they do, they are subjected to import duty but I would not be able to confirm that but I would say that there would be. I see no reason why they should be exempt, whether building materials are for reclamation or used on land I think that the importation has been done. In fact, I can confirm that they have paid duty because I remember them applying to me to see whether under the social and economic interests of Gibraltar I would exempt them from duty, and it was rejected.

ORAL

**NO. 926 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored in Gibraltar since the answer to Question 263 of 2005, showing the dates of the conferences in question, the cost and the department that was most directly involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

There have been none.

ORAL

**NO. 927 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the E-Business Advisory Council met since 2 February 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 817, 833, 902, 917 and 928 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 928 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Business Advisory Council met since 17 February 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being handed over in written format.

### **Schedule to Question 928**

- (a) Meetings of Transport Commission, 01/01/04 – 30/09/05.

9 <sup>th</sup> February 2004	11 <sup>th</sup> May 2005
6 <sup>th</sup> April 2004	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2005
14 <sup>th</sup> July 2004	9 <sup>th</sup> August 2005
18 <sup>th</sup> April 2005	19 <sup>th</sup> September 2005
27 <sup>th</sup> April 2005	

- (b) Meetings of Traffic Commission, 01/01/04 – 30/09/05.

21 <sup>st</sup> January 2004	9 <sup>th</sup> February 2005
4 <sup>th</sup> February 2004	7 <sup>th</sup> March 2005
10 <sup>th</sup> March 2004	9 <sup>th</sup> June 2005
19 <sup>th</sup> May 2004	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2005
22 <sup>nd</sup> September 2004	27 <sup>th</sup> September 2005
27 <sup>th</sup> October 2004	28 <sup>th</sup> September 2005
8 <sup>th</sup> December 2004	

- (c) Meetings of the Development and Planning Commission, 14/04/05 – 30/09/05.

4 <sup>th</sup> May 2005	7 <sup>th</sup> July 2005
12 <sup>th</sup> May 2005	29 <sup>th</sup> July 2005
9 <sup>th</sup> June 2005	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2005

- (d) Meetings of the Tourism Advisory Council, 25/02/05 – 30/09/05.

10<sup>th</sup> June 2005  
22<sup>nd</sup> September 2005

- (e) Meetings of the Port Advisory Council, 11/02/05 – 30/09/05.

12<sup>th</sup> May 2005  
8<sup>th</sup> September 2005

- (f) Meetings of the E-Business Advisory Council, 03/02/05 – 30/09/05.

5<sup>th</sup> May 2005  
1<sup>st</sup> September 2005

- (g) Meetings of the Business Advisory Council, 17/02/05 – 30/09/05.

7<sup>th</sup> July 2005  
15<sup>th</sup> September 2005

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 817, 833, 902, 917, 927 AND 928 OF**  
**2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is there any particular reason why the Transport Commission did not meet between 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and 18<sup>th</sup> April 2005? It seems to be a very protracted period of time.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot really give an answer because I was not the Chairman of the Transport Commission during that time, it was the Hon Fabian Vinet who is not in the House to give an explanation. The Commission meets at least on a monthly basis and if there are issues that need to be dealt with more urgently then we make arrangements for the Commission to meet. I assume each Chairman has different policies on how to conduct their business, I can only really be answerable since the Ministerial reshuffle in early July and in fact I have already met about four times since then, but I cannot really give an explanation in respect of the previous period but maybe my Colleague may be able to do so later during this Question Time.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I appreciate that and if to make things easier the Minister could investigate and come back in writing at a later stage.



ORAL

**NO. 929 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Government's participation at the AMRIE meeting which took place in Malta in May?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

## Schedule to Question 929

### International Hunting, Fishing & Tourism Fair

Official delegation:

Mr Dylan Ferrar - GTB Sales & Marketing Co-ordinator  
Mrs Maria Gloria Macedo - GTB Sales & Marketing Officer

Cost:

Mileage allowance	£ 83
Subsistence	£210
	£293

The Government does not have details of all the exhibitors at this event, that was not organised by the Gibraltar Tourist Board.

### Barcelona destination exhibition and workshop

Official delegation:

Mr Peter Canessa - Chief Executive, GTB  
Mr Nicky Guerrero - GTB Sales & Marketing Manager  
Mr Dylan Ferrar - GTB Sales & Marketing Co-ordinator

Cost:

Hire of hall and refreshments	£4,002
Flights	376
Hotel expenses	303
Transport expenses	153
Subsistence	242
Insurance	15
Courier	100
Promotional material	147
	£5,338

Gibraltar travel trade participants:

<u>Company</u>	<u>No. of Representatives</u>
Bland Limited	1
Cable Car	1
Calypso Tours	1
Emile Youth Hostel	2
Gibraltar Taxi Association	2
International Casino Club	1
Parodytur	1
Rock & Fortress	1

No contribution was sought from the Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar for attending this event.

**Contd Answer to Question 929**  
**Madrid destination exhibition and workshop**

Cost:

Hire of hall and refreshments	£3,706
Flights	87
Hotel expenses	409
Transport expenses	113
Subsistence	331
Insurance	30
Courier	100
Promotional nature, etc	320
	<u>£5,096</u>

Gibraltar travel trade participants:

<u>Company</u>	<u>No. of Representatives</u>
Bland Travel	1
Calypso Travel	1
Caleta Hotel	1
Elliott Hotel	1
GB Airways	1
Gibraltar Taxi Association	2
Herald Travel	2
International Casino Club	2
Parodytur	1

780 invitations to this event issued. 63 travel agents and 12 journalists/media representatives attended the workshop, as per the list at Annex A.

**Joint Tourism Workshop, Gibraltar**

The workshop was organised by the Mancomunidad, who met all costs. The Government is not aware of the costs incurred by the Mancomunidad. It was not a joint workshop: it was a showcase for the Mancomunidad tourism industry.

There were no Gibraltar exhibitors at the event. There were representatives from the seven Campo de Gibraltar municipalities.

The results of this event cannot be quantified against meaningful targets. It is not possible to say if the event met expectations as it was not organised by the Government.

**AMRIE High Level Conference**

Cost:

Flights	£325
Hotel accommodation	£347
Subsistence	£251
Travel expenses	<u>£ 52</u>
	<u>£975</u>

**Contd Answer to Question 929****Annex A**

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Participant</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>
Viajes Eroski	Carmen Munoz Infante	Responsable de
Viajes Ananta	Pilar Criado Garcia	Directora Comercial
Viajes Ausventura	Angel Tendero	Director
Viajes Ausventura	Eva Alonso	Ventas
Viajes Abora	Mari Cruz de los Reyes	Directora Oficina
Viajes Abora	Por Confirmar nombre	Jefe de Ventas
Abayac Viajes	Pilar Arroyo	Directora
Akhana Viajes	Mar Rodriguez de Vicente	Ventas
Abayac Viajes	Carlos Barona	Director
Viajes Fray Escoba	Juan Rodriguez	Director
Viajes Fray Escoba	Trinidad Moreno	Jefa de Grupos
Viajes Eroski	Cristina Chacartegui	Vendedora
IBS Viajes	Jose Maria Redondo	Director
IBS Viajes	Marisol Granados	Ventas
En Clave Rural	Israel Sanchez Fernandez	Encargado Agencia
Formula 98 Viajes	Laura Santiago Calvo	Ventas
Viajes Haciendo Huella	Alfonso Monge	Gerente
Formula 98 Viajes	Raquel Pastor Ramirez	Jefa de Agencia
Convenco Incentive Solutions	Manuel Alvarez	Director
Andy Tours	Antonio Diaz	Director Gerente
Andy Tours	Monica Torres	Directora Agencia
Viajes Iberia	Belen de Espona	Ventas
Viajes Iberia	Aurora Gonzalez	Ventas
Bus Card Booking Service	Mario Sanchez	Director de Producto
Viajes Arizona	Manuel Hernandez Rodriguez	Dpto Ventas
Capriccio Tours	Natalya Atamas	Agente de Viajes
Capriccio Tours	Sandra Manrique	Directora
Viajes Iberia	Antonio Viejo	Ventas
La Ruta de la Seda Viajes	Ana Roderia	Directora
Viajes Universal San Luis	Monica Lopez	Dpto Ventas
Viajes Universal San Luis	Marta Caso	Jefe de Oficina
Quo Viajes	Beatriz Navarro Lozano	Asesora de Viajes
Quo Viajes	Juan Manuel Borges	Asesor de Viajes
Quo Viajes	Raquel Lopez	Asesora de Viajes
Neoturismo Viajes	Andres Martin	Director Commercial
Viajes Bola del Mundo	Javier Carrillo	Director
Viajes Alcatour	Carlos Cocera de Juana	Responsable de
central		
Viajes Alcatour	Pablo Arias Hernandez	Responsable Sucursal
Barcelo Viajes	Carmen Avila	Agente de mostrador
Barcelo Viajes	Patricia Espiga	Agente de mostrador
Soluzion Viajes	Yolanda Acebron	Gerente
Soluzion Viajes	Miguel Quiles	Gerente
Terra Viajes	Carmen Fernandez	Directora Oficina
Terra Viajes	Aurora Moncalvillo	Agente de Ventas
Viajes los Pontones	Sin especificar nombre	Agente de Ventas
Viajes los Pontones	Ana Maria Gil Asenjo	Agente de Ventas
Viajes los Pontones	Sin especificar nombre	Agente de Ventas
Viajes Universal San Luis	Monica Lopez	Ventas
Viajes Universal San Luis	Marta Caso	Jefe de Oficina
Buscard	Paloma Camunas Fernandez	Promociones
Turisticas		

Cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 929**

Viajes Aguamar	Jose Antonio Terron	Jefe de Ventas
Viajes Aguamar	Elvira Terron	Directora
Viajes Vincit	Felisa Vela	Dpto Receptive
Grupos		
Galapagos Otras Rutas	Ana Belen Barbero	Ventas
Viajes Goya, S.A.	Francisco Javier Sanchez	Ventas
Gullivers Travel Associates	Inmaculada Moreno	Directora
Mundiespana	Patricia Dekert	Agente
Mindiespana	Veronica Puentes	Agente
Euroclub Tours	Luis Javier Araque Belloso	Vicepresidente
Viajes 2001	Jose Miguel Garcinuno Alvaro	Ventas
Cultural Link Viajes	Sabina Saturno	Gerente
Cultural Link Viajes	Rosa Rodriguez	Ventas
Viajes Abrantes	Miguel Nasser	Director
Periodico Equinoccio	Idola Bahun	Directora
TAT	Ma Fernanda Fernandez	Subdirectora
Interiores	Lydia de Miguel	Publicidad
Moneda Unica	Esmeralda Gayan	Redaccion
Europa Press	Javier Carron	Jefe Redaccion
Traveller	Adelaida Gutierrez	Jefe Publicidad
Traveller	Almudena Garcia	Redaccion
AirClasse	Virtudes Rodrigo	Redaccion
Travesias	Fernando Garcia	Director
TMG News	Jorge Diez Gomez	Publicidad
Nexotur	Esther Munoz Murillo	Jefe Marketing
Boletin Ecocharly	Susana Gomez	Redactora

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 887 TO 897 AND 929 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Barcelona destination exhibition and workshop the answer given is that no contribution was sought from the Mancomunidad de Municipios for attending this event. In other words, they participated, the event cost the Gibraltar Tourist Board £5,300 and the Mancomunidad participated for free, is that the position?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is the position but I think one has to understand that this is a Gibraltar event at which the Mancomunidad is allowed to set up a little table or stall in the same way as we have a number of local trade operators from Gibraltar who actually attend and sell their wares from there. In the same way as when we were invited to participate in the International Hunting Fish and Tourism Fair, we had our own little stand there and we were not charged anything for being there. It is a matter of swings and roundabouts in this so in the same way as we do not charge any of the local operators who attend these fairs, the hon Member will see in the list I have supplied that there are a number of companies from the local trade who participated and have their own little stands there, they only contribute in the form of paying their own air fares and hotels or whatever is required but actually the cost of participating in the actual workshop is not something that we charge for.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I think there is a difference between not charging members of the local tourist trade and the various companies that attended and having these people go for free. As I say, it is not quite the same as having the Mancomunidad participating in the event for free, and by point of observation perhaps not a question, I think it is not the same to go to a Tourism Fair in Barcelona for free, which is what happened to the Mancomunidad than for Gibraltar to attend one in Los Barrios. I do not think there is any comparison in that. Perhaps to phrase it as a question I can ask the Minister if he does not agree?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Obviously it is far more effective for them to go to Barcelona than it is for us to exhibit in Los Barrios. Having said that I think that the cost of this is really very insignificant for us to be debating this in the House.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the question on the AMRIE conference in Malta, the Minister supplied me with a breakdown and the cost which is £975, can I ask for how many people that was and for how many days?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There is a Gibraltar Government representative in AMRIE and that is Mr Richard Garcia and he was the one who attended the conference in Malta on his own.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

For how many days?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the conference was two or three days.

**ORAL**

**NO. 930 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government say how often and on what dates the following have met since 18 April 2005:

- (a) the Objective 2 Appraisal Sub-Committee/Small Grant Scheme Committee;
- (b) the Objective 3 Appraisal Sub-Committee?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 931 and 932 of 2005.



**NO. 931 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties that have applied for:

- (a) EU funding; or
- (b) Gibraltar Government funding;

since the last Question-Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purpose for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, that have been unsuccessful, and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 930 and 932 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 932 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government say what has been Gibraltar's contribution to date in respect of the Interreg III-B SUDOE architectural project?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

The information requested is set out in the attached schedule.

**Schedule to Question 932**

- (a) Meeting of Objective 2 Appraisal Sub-Group

25 May 2005

- (b) Meeting of Small Grant Scheme Committee

9 May 2005

23 June 2005

18 July 2005

26 July 2005

- (c) Meeting of Objective 3 Appraisal Sub-Group

27 May 2005

14 September 2005

- (d) Parties applied for EU funding

The parties who applied for funding from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) are at Annex 1. No applications are pending, and all were successful.

The parties who applied for funding from the European Social Fund (ESF) are at Annex 2.

Two applications are pending, the remainder were successful.

- (e) The cost of Gibraltar's participation in the ARQ SXX project to date is £2,100, 50% of which is payable by the EU.

# ERDF PROJECTS

Project No.	Sponsor	Status	ERDF	GOG	Purpose of Grant
81	The Gibraltar Echo (Publishing Ltd)	Withdrawn	£ 2,736 (15%)	£ 2,736 (15%)	Purchase of equipment, security camera, office furniture, signage, installation of air-conditioning, promotion and marketing
82	Let's Go Ltd	Active	£ 5,000 (13.99%)	£ 5,000 (13.99%)	Transport and logistics, health & safety, marketing and computerisation.
83	Radicals	Active	£ 4,942 (15%)	£ 4,942 (15%)	Building & renovation works.
84	Gibraltar Chronicle Ltd	Active	£35,032 (14.5%)	£35,032 (14.5%)	Purchase of equipment and payment of Import Duty.
85	Auto Mechanical Services	Active	£ 3,035 (15%)	£ 3,035 (15%)	Rent subsidy scheme, purchase of diagnostic machine and equipment.
86	J & J Baitson	Active	£ 4,585 (15%)	£ 4,585 (15%)	Building and renovation works, rent and rates subsidy scheme, purchase of equipment, payment of freight, import duty and marketing.
87	Barrow Hills Ltd	Active	£ 1,974 (15%)	£ 1,974 (15%)	Purchase of equipment, import duty and civil works.
88	Fotoart	Active	£ 3,025 (15%)	£ 3,025 (15%)	Purchase of equipment, work bench and rent and rates subsidy scheme.
89	Alborak Co Ltd	Active	£ 2,827 (15%)	£ 2,827 (15%)	Construction of Terrace, erection of safety verandah, rent & rates subsidy scheme.
90	Ming Ming Enterprises Ltd	Active	£ 3,145 (15%)	£ 3,145 (15%)	Purchase of equipment, building works and signage, rent and rates, marketing and the purchase of two delivery motor bikes.
91	Department of Transport	Active	£116,000 (50%)	£116,000 (50%)	Internal renovation of main office block, extending roof, roller shutter doors, painting, booth, main toilet and garage.

### ESF PROJECTS

Project No.	Name	Sponsor	Status	ESF	GOG	Private Sector	Purpose of Project
38	Deliverex	Department of Trade & Industry	Approved	£ 7,200 (45%)	£8,800 (55%)	-	Technical assistance for delivery and implementation of the Objective 3 Programme
39	Publicitex	Department of Trade & Industry	Approved	£ 2,700 (45%)	£ 3,300 (55%)	-	Technical assistance for the dissemination & awareness of ESF
40	ETTS 2005	Department of Education & Training	Approved	£178,173 (45%)	£ 59,392 (15%)	£158,376 (40%)	Apprenticeship programme leading towards NVQ's in engineering disciplines.
41	Focus 5505	Employment Service	Pending	£35,775 (45%)	£43,725 (55%)	-	Employment support measure for registered unemployed, ex-offenders or those recovering from an addiction.
42	CTC Intake 12	Department of Education & Training	Pending	£102,325 (45%)	£125,064 (55%)	-	3 year training scheme leading towards NVQ Level 2 in the construction disciplines.

**NO. 933 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

Can the Government confirm, given their previous public statements in respect of this matter, that the works at Cammell Laird shipyard on the vessel Rotterdam are in fact continuing and, if so, what has given rise to such a delay in the expected completion of works which were originally stated to be due for completion by September this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The works to remove asbestos were completed on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005, as stated by my colleague the Hon Bernard Linares, then Minister with responsibility for Employment, at the time of the meeting of this House in April 2005 in answer to supplementary questions consequent on Question No. 187 of 2005. The asbestos is stored aboard the ship in accordance with the relevant legal provisions. The asbestos will be safely removed for disposal when it next arrives at its port of origin in the Netherlands.

At present no works are being carried out on the Rotterdam as a result of the vessel having changed ownership for the second time since its arrival in Gibraltar. Government understand that Cammell Laird are awaiting instructions from the new owners, which they are expecting to receive shortly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 799 AND 933 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister did say, and he is right, that his predecessor said that the works were completed on 31<sup>st</sup> March but I think that a reading of the rest of the Hansard suggests that there might still have been things to be done, hence the question again in relation to the asbestos, and the revelation at the time that in fact the asbestos, although we were talking about removal works, it is not actually being totally removed from the vessel. It is being removed from those parts of the vessel which carry asbestos and being stored elsewhere on the vessel. The Minister has clarified that that is not going to be taken out of the vessel until it arrives at Amsterdam. The question of the Rotterdam was one which when the vessel arrived in Gibraltar was highlighted as one of the great things that was going to happen at Cammell Laird and one of the things that would create employment, in fact that is how the Government have dealt with the issue when we have asked questions and supplementaries on the

subject. Is the Minister therefore concerned that the delay in the works will have some effect on employment levels at Cammell Laird et cetera, or has he received assurances from the shipyard that this is not going to have an adverse effect on their ability to continue with having those people employed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not think that the delay is actually having any effect on the employment levels at Cammell Laird. However, Cammell Laird are uncertain as to what the new owners will want done with the vessel, and I am led to understand that they are currently awaiting final instructions from them which will actually enable them to complete the works that they first came to Gibraltar to be undertaken to be able then to return back to the Netherlands, which is what the initial objective was when the vessel first came to Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I take it from the various answers that we have had, this is just to clarify, that all works aboard the vessel are now stopped because the removal of asbestos was completed and because of the present change of ownership and the lack of clarity from the new owners as to what they wish? There is nothing going on aboard the vessel at the moment?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There is definitely nothing going on in respect of works on asbestos, the work in respect of asbestos is finished. My understanding is that there are some minor works on-going on the vessel but not in relation to any issue which should be of concern about a health and safety issue.

**NO. 934 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**LOAN TO BELL HOTEL LTD**

Can Government state whether and if so which loans for the purpose of funding investments have been approved by the Minister so as to make the interest payable exempt from tax for each tax year since 1996/1997?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Only one such loan has been approved by me under the Income Tax Ordinance. The loan in question was a loan from the ACC Bank in Dublin to Bell Hotel Limited. I approved this on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2005 that this loan should qualify for exemption under the provisions of section 3(35) of the Income Tax (Allowances, Deductions and Exemption) Rules 1992.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 934 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this in fact the only request that was made under that particular section and were there others that were rejected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This has been the only request since my time as Minister for Trade and Industry. During my time there have not been any rejected and I do not think that there has been a rejection before either, because on trying to find out there was very little knowledge whether any of these had actually been granted.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say what was the amount?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the amount was for £2.85 million and it was in respect of the current refurbishments that are currently being undertaken at the Elliott Hotel.

ORAL

**NO. 935 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say whether the Town Planning Department has now issued a scoping opinion setting out the areas of study and assessment to be covered in the EIA in respect of the East Side project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 936 to 938 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 936 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say who will conduct the Environmental Impact Assessment into the East Side project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 935, 937 and 938 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 937 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed East Side project, how many supported the project and how many were against it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 935, 936 and 938 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 938 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Has planning permission been granted to the East Side project and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Planning permission has not yet been granted to the East Side project.

The Town Planner has issued a scoping opinion for the project, setting out the issues to be addressed in an Environmental Impact Assessment. Responsibility for carrying out the EIA lies with the developer of the project. The Government understand that Halcrow has been appointed to carry out the EIA.

Three representations against the project were received.

ORAL

**NO. 939 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – BETTING INDUSTRY**

Can Government provide a breakdown by sex and nationality and full-time and part-time employment of the 284 increase in numbers of employees in the gambling and betting sub-industry in the October 2004 Employment Survey Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 940 of 2005.

**NO. 940 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – BETTING INDUSTRY**

Can Government provide a breakdown by sex and nationality and full-time and part-time employment of the 21 firms employing 840 persons in October 2003 and the 31 firms employing 1124 persons in October 2004 in the gambling and betting activity sub-industry according to the October 2004 Employment Survey Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Details which could identify the returns of individual private sector firms cannot be provided under the provisions of the Statistics Ordinance. I will, however, provide now to the hon Member a schedule setting out all the other information that he has requested but not broken down by firm, because that would be a breach of the Statistics Ordinance under which these surveys are conducted.

However, I would refer the hon Member, as he considers this information, to the footnote to Table 1 in the 2004 Employment Survey when analysing these figures. That footnote cautions that the nationality split as between UK British and Gibraltar presents problems of accuracy. Some employers classify all their British employees, including Gibraltarians, under the UK British Category and since no personal details are provided in the form it is not possible to differentiate between the two categories. This results in an understatement of the Gibraltarians in employment, and of course that is not something that affects just this answer but indeed he will find it as a footnote in Table 1 of the Survey and it is a problem of analysis affecting the table in the survey as well.

**Answer to Question 940 of 2005****Answer to Question 939****GAMBLING AND BETTING ACTIVITIES****OCTOBER 2004**

Nationality	Male		Female		TOTAL
	Full-time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	
Gibraltar	142	12	113	31	298
UK British	293	18	171	20	502
Moroccan	8	0	4	1	13
Spanish	35	0	30	23	88
Other E.U.	70	2	44	1	117
Other	66	0	40	0	106
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>1,124</b>

**OCTOBER 2003**

Nationality	Male		Female		TOTAL
	Full-time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	
Gibraltar	143	19	108	34	304
UK British	173	13	107	16	309
Moroccan	8	0	3	2	13
Spanish	32	2	18	12	64
Other E.U.	38	4	25	1	68
Other	46	0	35	1	82
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>840</b>

**Difference:**      **+174**      **- 6**      **+106**      **+10**      **+284**

Note:- This data must be read in the context of the footnote to Table 1 in the 2004 Employment Survey Report.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 939 AND 940 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

As regards the caution, presumably this is not something that is changing so therefore it would apply the same one year as the next, there is no reason to indicate that more people are either putting them as Gibraltarians or putting them as UK, so one could assume that whatever bias is there is a bias that is not changing, that it is the same year in year out, is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think one can assume that, one could speculate that, that is not an impossible position but it would be speculation. We have no way of knowing whether employers are consistent, indeed whether new employers are consistent as they come onto the market, we do not know. I think the preferable thing would be for the Statistics people to inform all these employers about the importance, from the point of view of statistical analysis, of the importance of answering the question accurately. Of course I suppose some of them would say that they are not immigration or status specialists and that how they establish the exact status, presumably a Gibraltarian is somebody that is registered under the Gibraltarian Status Ordinance. These are the sort of issues that I think lead personnel managers and private firms not to look at the questions legalistically, what can be done to produce statistics that enables us more carefully to see. For example, which I suppose is the hon Member's interest in this question, how many of these additional jobs are taken up by locals regardless of whether they were there to take them up in the first place or not, that is simply a matter of analysis, and how many are being taken up by labour coming in from outside just to take up these jobs. I agree that both types of jobs are economically valuable, one has a greater sociological value than the other and it would be interesting, but we have to be careful to bear this statistical collation difficulty in mind when we analyse these things but we will try to improve.

ORAL

**NO. 941 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – FRONTIER WORKERS**

Can Government state how many of the 3416 frontier workers in the private sector shown in Table 5 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report were employed in public sector entities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Of the 3,416 frontier workers in the private sector shown in Table 5 of the Employment Survey Report 2004, 73 were employed in the public sector entities as detailed in answer to Question No. 804 of 2005.

**NO. 942 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

Can Government state whether any feasibility studies have been carried out in relation to the Leisure Centre at King’s Bastion and if so, what were the results?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Feasibility studies are studies undertaken to see whether something is possible at a reasonable cost. When the feasibility of something is not in question there is obviously no need for a feasibility study. The feasibility of converting King’s Bastion into a leisure centre at reasonable cost has never been in question.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 942 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Have the Government then conducted a feasibility study into the management and the running of the leisure centre?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that issue was addressed in questions in this House yesterday when I understand that my hon Colleague the Minister for these matters, the Hon Mr Vinet, said that both options were still possible options under consideration by the Government. Namely, that it could be done as Casemates was done, in other words, Government develop it but then dispose of the operations of it by either leases, or licensing or granting concessions to private sector operators or that Government could run it as a sports and leisure centre facility. Both those options are still open and no, it has not been the subject matter of a decision or of a feasibility study because at the end of the day it is not a question of feasibility but whether it is something that the Government want to do in-house or would prefer to outsource. Indeed, if the hon Member’s interest is still on the subject that presumably was discussed yesterday at length, I should perhaps add that different parts of the leisure centre may lend themselves to different treatments in that regard. The leisure centre will contain many and varied activities in it, some of them may be appropriate for the Sports and Leisure Authority to run and others may not so they may be differently dealt with.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, I actually mentioned that myself whether it could be done both as in commercially parts and other parts by the Sports and Leisure Authority. My question is more on the need of the facilities that are going to be built. For example, the ten-pin bowling, have the Government seen that there is a need for these facilities? Of all the facilities that are being provided there have the Government made any study as to which is preferable from the other? For example, do we want ten-pin bowling or do we want another facility? Have the Government studied this and the needs for the community?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member means have we conducted a sort of questionnaire/referendum amongst every member of the community to see what facilities they would like to see in it, the answer is no. On the other hand, it is not rocket science and we are not exactly pioneers in Gibraltar in this respect, I think the concept of leisure centres both in the United Kingdom and in Spain, and in most other countries in Europe, is an established concept and the sort of things that go in them subject to a narrow range of variety tends to be a cross-section of leisure activities, at least one or more of which will attract or appeal to as many members of the community as possible. I happen to think that a bowling alley would be very popular indeed, because it is one of those things that provides family entertainment, that is to say, entertainment for the whole family, adults and children alike. So, no, we have not done a feasibility study to see if there is a huge demand in Gibraltar for a bowling alley but judging by the number of Gibraltarians that I have seen in the bowling alley near the Carrefour in Los Barrios when I have been there with my children, I would guess that it is going to be very popular indeed.

ORAL

**NO. 943 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TERCENTENARY EVENT**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the Government-owned companies that contributed £620,000 to the costs of the 2004 Tercentenary expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In fact it was only one, the contribution was made by Gibraltar Land (Holdings) Ltd.

ORAL

**NO. 944 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – VALUATION LIST**

Can Government state how many residential units were a) added and b) removed from the Valuation List for Rating Purposes in the final year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am informed that 34 residential units were added in the financial year 2003/2004 and 30 residential units were removed in the same year.

**ORAL**

**NO. 945 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

Can the Government give a breakdown of the cost of all travel by the Chief Minister on official business since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005 to date stating:

- (a) what the purpose of travel was;
- (b) who travelled with the Chief Minister;
- (c) who the Chief Minister met on each of the journeys undertaken; and
- (d) a breakdown of the travel expenses incurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 946 and 947 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 946 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

What was the cost of the attendance by the Chief Minister at the Conservative Party Conference 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 945 and 947 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 947 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

What was the cost of the attendance by the Chief Minister at the Labour Party Conference 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Invoices in relation to my attendance at the Labour Party Conference and the Conservative Party Conference have not yet been received. Therefore those that control this head of expenditure do not yet know what the exact cost of that was. I now hand the hon Member a schedule of the information requested in connection with my travel from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005 to date. It is quite informative. Of course, I cannot guarantee that it contains details of every single person that the Chief Minister "met" on each of the journeys undertaken. For example, I do not see any reference to the name of the chauffeur or people that I might have bumped into but I suppose the hon Member means the person for meeting which I travelled in the first place rather than everybody and that information is set out in the schedule.

Answer to Q947/2005

Chief Minister's travel on official business from 1 April 2005 to date

Date	Purpose	Persons travelling	Met with	Chief Minister's Travel Costs		
				Air fares & travel	Accommodation	Other
				£	£	£
10-May-2005	Spanish Pensions	CM/ Chief Secretary/ Michael Llamas	Foreign Office and Cabinet Office officials and advisers, and Dept of Works and Pensions	908	334	100
3-Jun-2005	Committee of 24	CM/ CS/ Media Director/ M Llamas	Addressed C24	2,350	567	45
17-Jun-2005	Pre-Trilateral meeting	CM/ Assistant Chief Secretary	Jose Pons, Director General for Europe of the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	33		30
8-Jul-2005	Trilateral Talks - Faro	CM/ CS/ MD/ ACS/ Senior Personal Secretary/ Driver/ Bodyguards	Spanish & British delegations	7	6,038	4,636
21-Jul-2005	Meeting with D Chilcott/ King's Bastion/ Minister for Europe	CM/ CS/ Private Secretary (Projects)	Dominic Chilcott/ Douglas Alexander/ Nigel Pardo	1,025	376	63
29-Jul-2005	Taxation of Savings Directive/ MoD	CM/ CS	HM Treasury	2,320	502	132
22-Aug-2005	Pre-Trilateral meeting	CM/ CS	Bernardino de Leon, Secretary of state at the Spanish Foreign Ministry	33		
26-Sep-2005	Labour Party Conference 2005 - Brighton	CM/ Private Secretary (Projects)		Not yet invoiced		
29-Sep-2005	Pre-Trilateral meeting - Malaga	CM/ CS	Jose Pons, Director General for Europe of the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	33		
3-Oct-2005	Conservative Party Conference 2005 - Blackpool	CM/ PS(Legal)		Not yet invoiced		
3-Oct-2005	UN 4th Committee - New York	CM/ Minister for Trade, Industry, Employment & Communications/ MD	Addressed 4th Committee on Decolonisation	Not yet invoiced		

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 945 TO 947 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I assume that there is an error in relation to the entry for 3<sup>rd</sup> June, is that correct? Could the Chief Minister confirm that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Certainly if he means did Mr Llamas accompany me to the United Nations, the answer is that he did not, if that is what he spotted. Nor by the way, is the £6,000 shown against the trilateral talks at Faro, the Chief Minister's travel costs, in other words, that must have been the cost of organising the conference itself, all the costs, but obviously I travelled to Faro by car and therefore it cannot have cost £6,000.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There is a reference to a meeting with one particular individual in relation to the 21<sup>st</sup> July as a result of travel who is a local individual, is that a meeting by chance in London or was there a need to travel to London to meet this individual?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Some of these meetings are for more than one purpose and whilst I am in London, from memory that trip was for meetings in the Foreign Office with the first two gentlemen mentioned, the other thing relates to a meeting that I had in London at that same trip in relation to the leisure centre, with the architects and things of that sort.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is the architects and not this gentleman?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, he was there but he was part of my team in contacts with the architects. I mean, he was not in the meeting at the Foreign Office and therefore missing from that list are sort of the people that I met, in fact the meeting was at the Gibraltar Government Office, but yes there was an architect.

ORAL

**NO. 948 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CIVIL LEGAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government give a breakdown of the amounts paid to each law firm (or Barrister) in respect of civil legal assistance and criminal legal aid in each of the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 948 of 2005**

The breakdown of amounts paid to each law firm (or Barrister) in respect of civil legal assistance and criminal legal aid in each of the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5 is as follows:-

**CIVIL LEGAL ASSISTANCE AND CRIMINAL LEGAL AID PAID TO LAW FIRMS AND BARRISTERS - FINANCIAL YEAR 2003/04**

<b>LAW FIRM/BARRISTER</b>	<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE (CIVIL CASES)</b>	<b>LEGAL AID (CRIMINAL)</b>
Attias & Levy	£14,557.00	
Budhrani & Co		£900.00
C A Gomez & Co	£21,299.22	
David Pannick QC	£63,000.00	
Gold Law	£1,784.50	
Hassans	£31,166.11	
HLB Perez/Rodriguez	£94,202.67	£2,551.00
Hodgson Bilton	£70,225.51	
Isola & Isola	£672.84	£1,126.00
J Leighton Williams	£5,000.00	
J Evans	£123,583.95	
Marrache & Co	£3,731.60	£2,387.00
Matthias Kelly QC	£14,085.00	
Phillips & Co	£255,791.38	£4,211.00
Radcliffes le Brasseur	£15,145.47	
Ray Pilley	£156,987.25	£3,968.00
S Bullock & Co	£5,648.80	
S R Bossino	£9,737.70	£6,734.75
Triay & Triay	£19,192.07	
Triay Stagnetto Neish		£2,192.50
	<u>£905,811.07</u>	<u>£24,070.25</u>

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 948 of 2005**

**CIVIL LEGAL ASSISTANCE AND CRIMINAL LEGAL AID PAID TO LAW FIRMS AND BARRISTERS - FINANCIAL YEAR 2004/05**

<b>LAW FIRM/BARRISTER</b>	<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE (CIVIL CASES)</b>	<b>LEGAL AID (CRIMINAL)</b>
A MacDonald	£23,969.80	
A Nicol QC	£1,500.00	
Attias & Levy	£4,114.93	£6,899.00
Budhrani & Co		£1,332.00
C A Gomez & Co	£46,599.73	
E C Ellul & Co	£38,845.71	
Gold Law	£18,478.04	
Hassans	£136,236.71	
HLB Perez/Rodriguez	£29,623.60	
Isola & Isola	£69,584.58	£1,800.00
J Evans	£120,757.72	
Marrache & Co	£91,964.43	£1,082.00
R Pilley	£12,623.29	£1,200.00
S Bullock & Co	£9,829.00	£1,968.00
S Bossino	£9,992.16	£11,794.75
Triay & Triay	£110,361.38	
	<u>£724,481.08</u>	<u>£26,075.75</u>

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 948 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is very illuminating and I am grateful to the Chief Minister for providing it because he knows this has been an issue highlighted by both sides of the House during the Budget Session. Can I ask him whether I am right in saying, and I think it will also be a source of concern for both sides of the House, these figures are not actually identical to the figure that we have seen in the actual figure in the Estimates for those years which I think we had all seen had gone well beyond £1 million, this is simmering just below the £1 million but I think we have seen the trend that had taken the figure beyond the £1 million. Can I ask whether those figures we have seen in the budget still require adjustment or these figures have some element of them missing?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not recall the exact figures, I certainly remember complaining that they had grown very high and it may well be that they are not the same as this. If they are not, I cannot tell him why the difference, it may be just the exact wording that he has used in his question but I am speculating I am not suggesting that as reliable. He asked, 'can Government give a breakdown of the amounts paid to each law firm in respect of civil legal aid and assistance in each of the financial years?', it might be that the question has been read literally, I would not have read it that way, but it may be that it has been read literally by the person who has produced the answer to mean paid in respect of legal aid cases that year, rather than paid in that year even if it referred to earlier years. In other words, that they have left out the payments that inevitably get made at the beginning of one financial year in respect of cases of the last. But look, that explanation is pure speculation on my part but I will certainly find out and let him know whether that is the reason.

ORAL

**NO. 949 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – US SPECIAL REPORT**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Gibraltar supplement in US News that coincided with Gibraltar's appearance before the UN Committee of 24 in June?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Tourist Board and the Finance Centre Departments took out advertising in the US Special Report published on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2005 at a cost of £14,289.54 and £14,512.33 respectively. If I could just add, there is no cost in publication but cost was incurred in advertising in it.



**NO. 950 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TECHNOLOGICAL PARK – LOS BARRIOS**

Can Government confirm that they have been involved in attracting an international company to locate a technological park in Los Barrios?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have met with representatives of a company wishing to set up a venture in Los Barrios. Such meeting was to explore what corporate facilities could be set up in Gibraltar to complement and enhance the Los Barrios venture. To what extent this contributed to any decision to set up the facility in Los Barrios the Government cannot say.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 950 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was the initial contact with this company made with the Government of Gibraltar or with the administration of the Mayor of Los Barrios?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know but certainly it was one of those projects that went through the MERCAMED project, which is a joint venture company between Los Barrios and Gibraltar, with a view to helping each other set up business either in one place or the other or in both. Hence the attempt in this case to see whether part of the operation, I do not think the project has yet by the way materialised in Los Barrios, but if it does hence the attempt to see what part of it could be located in Gibraltar. The underlying industrial activity is not one that could have been set up in Gibraltar so Gibraltar is delighted to be able to assist neighbouring Ayuntamientos to attract investment to them for the benefit of their economic and social development when it is not an activity that we can accommodate in Gibraltar, and that is precisely the sort of cooperation that I think is good for both of us.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government say, according to the reports that appeared at the time about 700 new jobs were expected to be created by this industrial development on that side of the border, do the Government know what the number of jobs that will be created in Gibraltar is expected to be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, first of all it is by no means clear that this project is going ahead in Spain, it relies on very heavy funding from Andalucian Objective I EU funding, which I do not know if it is going to be forthcoming or not so the question is entirely speculative. Of course Gibraltar would have no chance of hosting an activity which included 700 manual jobs, we would not have the space, we would not have the labour force and so where Gibraltar was contemplating the possibility of a participation is on the corporate side as opposed to on the industrial side which is what this economy is much more geared up to participate through.

**ORAL**

**NO. 951 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LIABILITY INSURANCE**

Can Government say who was the successful tenderer and in what amount and how many tenders there were in total in respect of the following:

- (a) Provision of Port and Terminal Operators Liability Insurance;
- (b) Provision of Airport Liability Insurance;

indicating whether the successful tenderer was the lowest bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Tenders were invited locally for both of these insurances on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2005. Only one tender was received for both the provision of Port and Terminal Operators Liability Insurance and Airport Liability Insurance.

Callaghan Insurance Brokers Ltd were awarded both tenders, at a lower cost than that tendered since some amendments were found necessary to the overall cover required.

The provision of Port and Terminal Operators Liability Insurance (including Terrorism Liability cover) was awarded for an annual premium of £66,500.

The provision of Airport Liability Insurance (including Terrorism Liability cover) was awarded for an annual premium of £47,500.

ORAL

**NO. 952 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FREIGHT FORWARDING SERVICES**

Has the tender for the provision of freight forwarding services to Government departments and agencies now been awarded and if so can Government indicate the name of the successful company and the amount bid, the total number of tenderers and whether the tender was awarded to the lowest bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The tender has not yet been awarded and remains under consideration.

ORAL

**NO. 953 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NEW HARBOURS INDUSTRIAL PARK**

Have Government now completed their consideration of the proposal they received regarding the New Harbours Industrial Park and has a policy decision been taken to proceed with it or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It would not be appropriate to give publicly details or an account of transactions of a commercial nature before they were completed. However, no offer capable of acceptance or of being proceeded with has been received by the Government from the tenants of the park.

**NO. 954 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**MAJOR INCIDENT & EMERGENCY ADVISORY BOOKLET**

What further progress, if any has been made on the envisaged Government publication and circulation of information on what procedures citizens should follow in the event of an environmental emergency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Major Incident and Emergency Advisory booklet will be distributed to all households in Gibraltar during October, in fact I think it is scheduled to take place the weekend after next. The Advisory booklet will also be available in the Gibraltar Government website, and although the copy to be distributed will be the English version there is also a stock of the booklet in Spanish in case any household prefers it in that language.

ORAL

**NO. 955 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**POLICE & CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT 1984**

Have the Government now received the further information they requested in respect of the reports submitted to them in relation to the possibility of implementation in Gibraltar of the whole or parts of the Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The report in question, the one that was still awaited, related to the financial implications to Government of adopting parts of PACE and that report on those financial implications have been submitted to my office earlier this week but I have not yet had an opportunity to consider them.

**ORAL**

**NO. 956 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 957 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 957 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested by the hon Member is on the schedule that I hand over to him.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 957/2005**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 956/2005**

Persons employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

Month	No. of Employers	No. of Employees	Gib	Other British	Spanish	Moroccan	Other EEC	Other Non-EEC
April-05	15	686	483	112	36	2	50	3
May-05	15	678	476	113	36	2	48	3
June-05	15	691	485	116	36	2	49	3
July-05	15	687	485	112	36	2	49	3
August-05	15	691	483	116	34	2	53	3
September-05	15	696	487	114	34	2	56	3

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 957/2005**

Persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

Month	No. of Employers	No. of Employees	Gib	Other British	Spanish	Moroccan	Other EEC	Other Non-EEC
April-05	31	234	132	80	15	0	5	2
May-05	31	236	134	79	15	0	4	4
June-05	31	236	135	78	15	0	4	4
July-05	31	239	138	78	15	0	4	4
August-05	31	241	141	78	15	0	3	4
September-05	31	241	139	81	14	0	3	4

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 956 AND 957 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful. This is a question that is answered at every House, should I take the figure in relation to Gibraltarians to be caveated in the same way that the Chief Minister has told the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the Employment Survey aspects of British and Gibraltar entries?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him that, the previous answer comes straight from the Statistics Department and out of the official statutory survey. I believe that this information may come directly from the industry and therefore it may be that the Finance Centre Department has a more direct liaison, it is not just contained in surveys, so it may be but it may not be and I will confirm that to him.

**NO. 958 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELECTRONIC MONEY INSTITUTIONS**

Can Government state how many applications or licences to operate an electronic money institution have been received or granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No applications to operate an electronic money institution have been received and therefore no licences have yet been granted.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 958 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We noted that the rules in relation to the cost of operating a money institution have risen in the last Gazette, or penultimate Gazette, is that because it is envisaged that there may be applications and this may be an opportunity to raise revenue from a sector that would not blink when it came to a cost of that sort for a licence?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the grant of these licences is a matter for the Financial Services Commission and the licence fee goes to them and not to the Government, so if it were a revenue-raising measure it is a revenue-raising measure by the Financial Services Commission and not the Government. I do not think the reason for it is that here is a sector that can be stung with disproportionate fees, the FSC proposes these structures to the Government, the Government consults before approving them, for example, if the FSC were to suggest to the Government an increase in the Banking Licence fees we would not just say 'yes', we would consult the banking industry. After all the level of the fees is a governmental decision not an FSC decision. In this area it is difficult to consult because there are not any yet so we assume that these fees have been suggested by reference to some sensible criteria, perhaps comparison with competitor jurisdictions, I do not know. But the Government approved them because they had no reason not to and we will see, if they turn out to be too high presumably applications will not materialise.

ORAL

**NO. 959 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**IMF ANNUAL WORKSHOP**

Can Government state what has been the cost of organising the IMF Annual Workshop for National Compilers for the Co-ordinated Portfolio Investment Survey for Small Economies with International Financial Centres (3-5 May)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 960 and 961 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 960 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL JOURNALISTS VISIT**

Can Government state what was the cost of organising the annual financial journalists visit to Gibraltar (28-30 June)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 959 and 961 of 2005.

**NO. 961 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES - CONFERENCES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the months of April to the end of September 2005, giving the name of the conference, the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 959**

The IMF Annual Workshop for National Compilers for the Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey for Small Economies with International Financial Centres (3-5 May) is entirely funded each year by the Government of Japan. Gibraltar volunteered and was accepted to host this year's Workshop. The only cost to the Government, given that it was all financed by Japan wherever it takes place, was £656 for a reception which the Government of Gibraltar hosted for the participants on 3 May 2005 at a local hotel.

**Answer to Question 960**

The cost of organising the annual financial journalists' visit to Gibraltar (28-30 June) is as follows – 15 journalists attended:

Flights	£1,937.20
Accommodation	£2,168.45
Reception & Meals	£2,254.25
Transport	£ 420.00
TOTAL	£6,779.90

The Finance Centre attended four conferences related to financial services in the months of April to the end of September 2005. Details of these are set out in the schedule that I hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 961**

**RIMS (Risk & Insurance Management Society) – Philadelphia, USA 18 – 20 April 2005**

Attended by: Mr James Tipping – Finance Centre Director  
Mr Joseph Macano – Director Licensing Unit  
Mr Chris Collins – Insurance Supervisor (FSC)

Flights & Accommodation	£7,375.00
Exhibition fees	£4,269.36
Expenses	£1,101.23
<hr/>	
TOTAL:	£12,745.59

**London Rendez-Vous Insurance Conference 12-13 May 2005**

Attended by: Mr James Tipping – Finance Centre Director  
Mr Francis Sanchez – Executive Officer

Flights & Accommodation	£1,402.00
*Exhibition fees	£2,500.00
Expenses	£ 593.86
<hr/>	
TOTAL:	£4,495.86

\*We have not yet been invoiced for exhibiting at the London Rendez-Vous, but the contracted price was £2,500.

**IBC Wealth Management Congress 25-26 May 2005**

Attended by: Mr James Tipping – Finance Centre Director  
Mr Joseph Macano – Director Licensing Unit

Flights & Accommodation	£1,484.00
Expenses	£ 609.26
<hr/>	
TOTAL:	£2,093.26

Cont....



### **Cont'd Answer to Question 961**

The Finance Centre attended four (4) conferences related to financial services in the months of April to the end of September 2005. Details of these are set out in the schedule that I now hand to the hon Member.

AIRMIC (Association of Insurance & Risk Managers), Brighton 13-15 June 2005

**Attended by: Mr Joseph Macano – Director Licensing Unit  
Mr Francis Sanchez – Executive Officer**

	£
<b>Flights &amp; Accommodation</b>	1,683.90
<b>Exhibition Fees</b>	6,461.86
<b>Expenses</b>	480.00
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<u>8,626.16</u>

### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 959 TO 961 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The schedule shows that attendance at the Risk and Insurance Management Society cost in the region of £12,700 but one of the parties attending was Mr Chris Collins, the Insurance Supervisor of the FSC, do these costs also relate to his attendance and was his attendance financed by the Government or was his attendance financed separately by the FSC?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot be absolutely certain of the answer to that supplementary and I do not have that information here but I think that it is not paid for by the FSC on the grounds that they come in support of the Government's marketing efforts, which is not strictly speaking something that their funds can be statutorily applied to because it is not one of their statutory functions. I believe that that is the position but I cannot be absolutely certain.

ORAL

**NO. 962 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the months of April 2005 to the end of September 2005 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 963 and 967 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 963 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies were registered in Gibraltar in each of the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 962 and 967 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 964 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many companies have been re-domiciled out of Gibraltar in each month from April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 965 and 966 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 965 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 964 and 966 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 966 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached schedule.

### **Answer to Question 966**

### **Answer to Question 964/2005**

The following companies have lodged applications for consent to re-domicile out of Gibraltar in the months from April to September 2005.

The Registrar gives consent 30 days after the notice is issued and consent is given almost without exception.

April	15
May	28
June	25
July	38
August	19
September	22

### **Answer to Question 965/2005**

The following were removed from the companies register in the months of April to September 2005.

April	183
May	160
June	275
July	328
August	148
September	196

Cont.....

**Contd Answer to Question 966**

**Answer to Question 966/2005**

The following companies were formed in the months of April to September 2005:

April	142
May	143
June	104
July	160
August	143
September	140



**ORAL**

**NO. 967 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new banking licences have been issued in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No applications to form a Protected Cell Company have been submitted in the months of April to September 2005 which remain pending consideration, nor have been rejected.

White Rock Insurance (Europe) PCC Limited was licensed on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2005. That being the second company now on the register.

No new banking licences have been issued in the months of April to September 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 968 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many companies have, since April 2005, applied to the office of the Finance Centre Director for the grant of exempt status and of these how many are presently awaiting the grant of said exempt status?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 969 and 970 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 969 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 968 and 970 of 2005.

**NO. 970 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates have been issued in the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 968**

Since April 2005, a total of 178 applications have been received for tax exempt status. Out of these, eight companies have been prioritised for the granting of tax exempt status on the basis of the 'economic benefit' to Gibraltar criteria that I think we have discussed in this House before. The remaining 170 are awaiting the granting of exempt status based on the availability of slots.

**Answer to Question 969**

The number of tax exempt companies which have terminated their tax exempt certificates come to a total of 335. This figure is made up as follows:

April	88
May	65
June	40
July	54
August	40
September	48
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>335</u></b>

"Terminated their tax exemption" is interpreted by the Finance Centre Department as companies which have returned their certificates and no longer require exempt status.

There were 14 tax exempt certificates issued in the months of April to September. These have been issued on the basis of 'economic benefit' to Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 968 TO 970 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just in trying to determine the difference between the eight in the 178 of the Chief Minister's first answer and the 14 of his final answer, would the remaining six applied for before April but granted after also with those eight, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I assume that that is the distinction. The question No. 968 asked 'can Government state how many companies have since April 2005 applied to this office?', Question No. 970 says, 'can Government state how many tax exempt certificates have been issued in the months of April to September?' – so one question relates to the date of application, another to the date of issue, so logically that would explain the difference.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Although we have got this de-glossing exercise going on we see that 335 certificates have gone and we have 170 non prioritised applicants waiting. Is there an average time that those non prioritised applicants may have to wait or is it impossible to say at this time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is impossible to say. I think that there was a hiatus at the start of this whole system where applications were all delayed when the quota system first bit. I think that now is out of the system and it is just a question of managing the stock and this is done by the Finance Centre Department in accordance with a range of Government criteria, the foremost of which is this economic benefit as opposed to the brass plate use of the exempt companies, but once those are attended they apply this and there is no time that can be prognosticated. There are times of the year when a large number are surrendered, usually coinciding with the time of the year when the tax is payable. Then the numbers that are surrendered during the year is a matter of driblets and drabs and there is no way of assessing how those are going to be, so those people in the queue have to wait. The system is, as he knows, temporary and transitional and hopefully the need for these things will have diminished of late anyway for reasons of which he is aware.

**ORAL**

**NO. 971 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of each of the months of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 972, 973 and 974 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 972 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status in Gibraltar in each month from April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 971, 973 and 974 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 973 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government state whether any Qualifying Category 3 individuals have had their certificates renewed for a further period and if so when and in which cases?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 971, 972 and 974 of 2005.



**NO. 974 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status in Gibraltar in each month of April to September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 971**

In the months of April to September 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status:-

April	4
May	0
June	1
July	0
August	2
September	4

**Answer to Question 972**

In the months of April to September 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status:-

April	3
May	0
June	17
July	5
August	2
September	5

**Answer to Question 973**

No Category 3 individuals have had their certificates renewed for a further period under the Qualifying (Category 3) Individuals (Amendment) (No. 2) Rules 2005.

**Answer to Question 974**

In the months of April to September 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status:-

April	5
May	0
June	1
July	2
August	1
September	1

From which we can deduce that May is not a popular month for any of the statuses.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 971 TO 974 OF 2005****HON F R PICARDO:**

What can we deduce from the spike in the grant of Category 3 status in June, where 17 certificates were granted, is there anything that the Chief Minister can tell the House about that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not on the basis of any specific information available to me here. If I was obliged to offer a guess or possibility it would be that one of the more recent gaming companies continues to expand their labour force, and this can only really be that.

**NO. 975 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING LICENCES**

Has the Chief Minister now met with the Financial Services Commissioner and clarified with him the issue of the FSC providing information on the number of pending applications for banking licences, and if he has, when was the meeting held and what was the outcome of those discussions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No meeting on this subject has taken place between me and the Financial Services Commissioner. However, finance centre department officials have raised this issue with him and appear to have resolved it since some of the answers that I have just given give information about whether there are any licences pending. The position appears to be that the FSC will provide information to Government subject to any specific legal confidentiality provisions under which it operates. The Government, I think it could probably be agreed on both sides of this House, do require to be informed about the number and nature of pending applications for licences, since this is information that is germane to the management and monitoring of the economy in general and the development of the finance centre in particular. If such information were not to be available to the Government under some claim of legal stricture, the Government would have to legislate to remove any such legal obstacle to the provision to it of that sort of information, but it appears that that may not be necessary because that information is now flowing.

ORAL

**NO. 976 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SAVINGS DIRECTIVE**

What “appropriate arrangements” are the Government considering entering into with the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to the Savings Directive in particular and exchange of information generally?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The arrangements remain under negotiation, but it is envisaged that they will be similar to the UK’s arrangements with the Crown Dependencies.

**NO. 977 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BETTING INDUSTRY**

Can Government say how many persons are employed in the betting industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by company and by nationality, showing how many are Gibraltarian as at 30 June 2005 and 30 September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This data has not been compiled for 30<sup>th</sup> June 2005 but is available for 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005.

A total of 1,349 persons were employed by 15 companies, this is based on information supplied by the gaming operators themselves. This compares to 1,107 employed by the 15 companies on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005. The breakdown requested by the hon Member as at that date is on the schedule that I now hand him. The breakdown relates to September 2005.

**OFFSHORE GAMING COMPANIES - EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2005**

	<u>Gibraltarian</u>	<u>Other British</u>	<u>Spanish</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ladbrokes (Gibraltar) Limited	20	41	7	1	69
Victor Chandler (International) Limited	70	158	14	57	299
Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited	5	95	1	13	114
BAW International Limited	17	22	7	37	83
Eurobet (Gibraltar) Limited	1	1	0	5	7
Carmen Media Group Limited	21	12	3	13	49
32 Red Plc (Formerly Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited)	8	17	0	2	27
St Minver Limited	21	16	0	12	49
Digibet Limited	0	0	2	1	3
888 Holdings Plc (Formerly Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited)	75	166	9	116	366
Globet.com Group Limited	0	1	0	7	8
International Betting Association Limited	0	0	1	4	5
PartyGaming Plc	29	76	4	56	165
Mansion (Gibraltar) Limited	3	53	0	36	92
Futuresbetting.com Limited	1	11	0	1	13
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>1349</b>

Source : Office of the Financial & Development Secretary

ORAL

**NO. 978 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PROPOSED DRAFT GAMBLING BILL**

Can Government list the parties that they sent a copy of the consultation paper entitled "Proposed Draft Gambling Bill" dated 17 June 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 979 of 2005.

**NO. 979 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PROPOSED DRAFT GAMBLING BILL**

Can Government list the entities who returned comments to the Government on the consultation paper entitled "Proposed Draft Gambling Bill" dated 17 June 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In addition to all licensed Gaming Companies, the Government sent the Consultation Paper to the following parties:-

BetBull  
BAW International Ltd  
Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited  
Mansion (Gibraltar) Limited  
Victor Chandler (International) Limited  
Ladbrokes (Gibraltar) Limited  
Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited  
Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited  
Carmen Media Group Limited  
Partygaming/Bay Management  
Eurobet  
Globet  
Digibet  
International Betting Association  
St Minver Limited  
Futurebetting.com  
Gala Casino  
Rock Turf Accountants Ltd  
Maxstead Holdings Ltd  
Gibraltar Amusement Machine Operators Association  
Gibraltar Betting and Gaming Association  
Gibraltar Regulatory Authority

It is not appropriate for Government to give details of parties who chose to submit their views. I think he also asks who answered or words to that effect, I do not mind telling him but there were several individual responses and then a substantial response from the Gibraltar Betting and Gaming Association, which is the industry body for all the licensees.



**ORAL**

**NO. 980 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ON-LINE GAMBLING**

Can Government say whether the Gibraltar or British Governments have received representations from the United States of America regarding on-line gambling from Gibraltar and if so on what date and with what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

We have received no representations and further we have not been advised by the British Government that it has received any such representations.

ORAL

**NO. 981 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY – MARINE MECHANIC**

How many persons applied for the post of Marine Mechanic advertised in July, how many vacancies were there, and has the post now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Six applications were received for one Marine Mechanic vacancy. However, only one applicant met the qualification requirements. That applicant was not found suitable for appointment and therefore the post has not yet been filled.

**ORAL**

**NO. 982 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

Can Government state when they propose to amend the Public Health Ordinance in order to give effect to their Budgetary measure to extend Rating Relief to institutions and other organisations that do not presently meet the requirements of the Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Question withdrawn.

**NO. 983 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government state whether a new contract with Land Property Services is now in place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No new contract has been signed yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 983 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

At the last Question Time it was imminent, is it still imminent?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well this is rather like the 95 per cent and the 5 per cent of the mooted airport agreement. I understand that there is one issue left outstanding between the parties, which is under negotiation between them, and that is the treatment that should be given to occupational pensions. The hon Member knows, I have told him in the past, that the new agreement is on the basis of cost plus as opposed to a share of public revenue. The issue left outstanding, assuming that it has not been resolved and I am yet to be informed about it, the issue left outstanding when I was last briefed on the matter was at what rate should the Government under the cost element of the agreement contribute to the occupational pensions of LPS to the extent that the scheme may be more expensive than the public sector Civil Service pensions scheme. That is the issue that was under discussion and when that is resolved I suspect the contract can be signed. I believe that is the last point that was outstanding.

**ORAL**

**NO. 984 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Can Government state the number of expatriates in Government service, including Agencies and Authorities, as at 30 September 2005 whose remuneration was not subject to the Income Tax PAYE regime?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 985 of 2005.

**NO. 985 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Can Government state the number, if any, of non-expatriates in Government service, including Agencies and Authorities, as at 30 September 2005 whose remuneration was not subject to the Income Tax PAYE regime?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not possible to answer the questions as formulated because the term “expatriate” is not recognised in either the Tax Office’s nor the Human Resources Department’s computer databases. Consequently, it is not possible to manipulate the data to extract any information of the nature required.

I can, however, confirm to the hon Member that the PAYE Regulations apply to all employees, except for individuals in respect of whom a certificate has been issued under the Qualifying (Category 3) Individuals Rules or Qualifying (Category 4) Individuals Rules.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 984 AND 985 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister say how many do have this Category 3 or Category 4 certificate and are in Government service?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

All the ones that I answered in questions asked by his colleague before when he asked me how many new applicants there were. The total number of holders of Categories 3 and 4, I do not have that information but from memory and therefore not to be held against me, I think it is something like 100. There are 39 Category 4’s, I am just getting this from information provided for supplementaries, and 118 active Category 3’s. My estimate was going to be just a little bit lower than that so it is just as well. That information was in my crib for the answer to questions asked by the Hon Mr Picardo in case he had asked that in supplementaries but he did not.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The information I am interested in is of those that are in Government service. Are these 118 all in Government Service as at Category 3 or Category 4? Could the Chief Minister confirm that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I can confirm to him that they are not. Not all of them, I do not know whether there are one or two but certainly not more than that.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister undertake to write to me and let me know how many of them are in Government service of those 118 Category 3 and 39 Category 4? Also a breakdown of those, if any, that are Gibraltarian and those that are not Gibraltarian.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not mind undertaking or agreeing to write in respect of something which derives from the question that I have been asked but if the hon Member wants information which is not sought by the question asked, I would rather that he wrote to me just to make sure that I do not forget and then certainly in answer to that letter he will get the information. So if he would write to me or to my office.

ORAL

**NO. 986 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SENIOR FIRE OFFICERS**

Can Government say whether they have now looked at and/or come to a policy decision in respect of the claim from retired Senior Fire Officers regarding backdated pay and conditions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, the matter remains under consideration.



ORAL

**NO. 987 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**FIRE FIGHTERS**

Can Government state when the change in the terms of employment of fire fighters in respect of which they became entitled to an enhancement of their pension as payment for additional ambulance duties came into effect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 988 to 991 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 988 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**FIRE FIGHTERS**

Can Government state whether the proposal to remunerate fire fighters for undertaking ambulance duties was on the initiative of the staff side or the management?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 987 and 989 to 991 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 989 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**FIRE SERVICE**

Can Government state in which financial year the enhancement to fire service pensions for ambulance duty first became payable, how many officers became eligible and what was the additional cost to pension payments in that first year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 987, 988 and 990 to 991 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 990 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**FIRE SERVICE**

Can Government state how many fire service personnel have retired in each financial year since the 26 per cent uplift in pension entitlement was introduced as payment for duties connected with the ambulance service giving the number and grades in each year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 987 to 989 and 991 of 2005.

**NO. 991 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**FIRE SERVICE**

Can Government state what has been the cost in each financial year of the 26 per cent uplift in pension entitlement since it was introduced for fire service grades as payment for duties connected with the ambulance service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 987**

The change giving entitlement to Firefighters to receive enhancement to pension as payment for ambulance duties came into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2000.

**Answer to Question No. 988**

The proposal to remunerate Firefighters for undertaking ambulance duties was an initiative of Management following representations from the Staff Side.

**Answer to Question No. 989**

The enhancement to Fire Service pensions for ambulance duty first became payable in the financial year 1999/2000. A total of 75 officers became eligible. There was no additional cost to pensions in that first year given that the first retirement, following the introduction of the enhancement to pensions, occurred in the financial year 2000/2001.

**Answer to Question No. 990**

A total of 21 officers have retired since the uplift in pension entitlement was introduced. The details of numbers and grades in each financial year is as follows:

<u>Financial Year</u>	<u>Numbers</u>	<u>Grade</u>
1999/2000	Nil	
2000/2001	1	Divisional Officer
	2	Sub-Officer
	1	Chief Fire Officer
	1	Leading Firefighter
	2	Firefighter
	<u>1</u>	Station Officer
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>8</u></b>	
2001/2002	1	Deputy Chief Fire Officer
	1	Leading Firefighter
	<u>1</u>	Firefighter
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>3</u></b>	
2002/2003	2	Firefighter
	<u>1</u>	Divisional Officer
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>3</u></b>	
2003/2004	1	Firefighter
	<u>1</u>	Leading Fire Control Operator
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>2</u></b>	
2004/2005	1	Firefighter
	<u>1</u>	Fire Control Operator
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>2</u></b>	
2005/2006	<u>3</u>	Firefighters
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>3</u></b>	

**Answer to Question No. 991**

The cost of the 26 per cent uplift in pension entitlement since it was introduced as payment for duties connected with the Ambulance Service is as follows:-

<u>FINANCIAL YEAR</u>					
<u>2000/01</u>	<u>2001/02</u>	<u>2002/03</u>	<u>2003/04</u>	<u>2004/05</u>	<u>2005/06</u>
£3,786.40	£5,956.81	£9,605.47	£15,761.70	£18,826.52	£12,417.22

**ORAL**

**NO. 992 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC EMPLOYEES**

Can Government state how many posts within Government Departments, if any, are currently occupied by seconded GDC employees, giving a breakdown by department and employee grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No established posts within Government Departments are occupied by seconded GDC employees.

**ORAL**

**NO. 993 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can Government state how many employees in the Gibraltar Sports Authority currently are direct employees of the Authority and how many are Civil Servants giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 994 to 996 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 994 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government state how many employees in the Elderly Care Agency currently are direct employees of the Agency and how many are Civil Servants giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 993, 995 and 996 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 995 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state how many employees in the Social Services Agency currently are direct employees of the Agency and how many are Civil Servants giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 993, 994 and 996 of 2005.

**NO. 996 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state how many employees in the Gibraltar Electricity Authority currently are direct employees of the Authority and how many are Civil Servants giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 993**

All 23 employees in the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority are direct employees of the Authority working under a single Collective Agreement and Conditions of work. I now hand the hon Member a breakdown.

**Answer to Question No. 994**

With the exception of the Manager and one Nursing Assistant, the remaining employees are directly employed by the Elderly Care Agency.

**Answer to Question No. 995**

The Social Services Agency currently employs a total of 149 employees, of which 110 are direct employees of the Agency and 39 are Civil Servants.

**Answer to Question No. 996**

All 149 employees currently working for the Gibraltar Electricity Authority are direct employees of the Authority.

All the breakdowns relating to the four Authorities that he has asked about are in the schedule.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 996**

**HANDOUT TO QUESTION 993**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AND LEISURE AUTHORITY**

1	Chief Executive Officer
1	Admin and Finance Manager
1	Facilities and Resources Manager
1	Sports Development and Training Officer
1	Assistant Sports Development Officer
1	Office Manager
3	Duty Managers
2	Administrative and Clerical Officer
1	Administrative and Secretarial Assistant
2	Supervisory Groundsmen
6	Sports Assistants
2	Groundsmen
1	Cleaner

Cont...

**CONTD. ANSWER TO QUESTION 996**

**HANDOUT TO QUESTION 994**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

1	Manager	(Civil Servant)
2	Executive Officers	
10	Administrative Officers	
2	Personal Secretaries	
1	Catering Manager	
1	Office Helper	
1	Domiciliary Care Coordinator	
1	Nursing Coordinator	
1	Deputy Nursing Coordinator	
30	Registered General Nurses	
1	Senior Enrolled Nurse	
4	Enrolled Nurses	
1	Physiotherapist	
8	Nursing Auxiliaries	
116	Nursing Assistants	(1 Civil Servant)
2	Activities Coordinator	
2	Industrial Technicians	
1	Maintenance Operative	
1	Senior Cook	
3	Cooks	
5	Assistant Cooks	
8	Domestic Catering	
15	Domestic Residential Floors	
8	Domestics Laundry	
1	Storeman/Driver	
1	Seamstress	
6	Labourers	
233	<b>Total Staff</b>	

Cont...

**CONTD. ANSWER TO QUESTION 996****HAND OUT TO QUESTION 995****SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY****GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES**

1	Chief Executive
2	Team Leaders
3	Senior Social Workers
8	Social Workers (1 x Part-time)
1	Trainee Social Worker
1	Counsellor Psychologist
1	Community Services Officer
1	Drug Strategy Co-ordinator
1	Executive Officer
1	Administrative Officer
1	Typist
	St Bernardette's Occupational Therapy Centre
1	Manager
1	Teacher
2	Enrolled Nurse
1	Administrative Officer (Part-time)
12	Classroom Aides (6 x Part-time)
1	Vehicle Escorts
<b>39</b>	<b>TOTAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES</b>

**AGENCY EMPLOYEES**

1	Counsellor
1	Finance Officer
4	Administrative Officers
1	Assistant Probation Officer
1	Receptionist
1	Shop Mobility Attendant
1	Day Centre Support Worker
	Dr Giraldi Home
1	Manager
1	Deputy Manager
4	Senior Support Workers
40	Support Workers (13 x Part-time)
1	Handyman/Driver
7	Domestic Workers (Part-time)
	Children Residential
6	Senior Care Workers
40	Care Workers (10 Part-time)
<b>110</b>	<b>TOTAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES</b>

Cont..

**COMPLEMENT OF THE GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

DESCRIPTION OF GRADE	NO. OF EMPLOYEES
<b>Day Workers – Technical Staff</b>	
Chief Executive	1
Deputy Chief Executive	1
Senior Engineer	3
Engineer	5
Officer	11
Inspector	2
Supervisor	1
Technician	48
Skilled Operative	25
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Day Workers – Financial &amp; Administration</b>	
Finance and Administration Director	1
Financial and Administration Manager	1
Asst. Financial and Administration Manager	1
Financial and Administration Officer	9
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Shift Workers</b>	
Systems Engineer	5
Control Room Operator	5
Senior Engine Room Operator	5
Mechanical Fitter	17
Engine Room Operative	5
Mechanical Operative	3
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>40</b>
	<b>149</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 993 TO 996 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the case of the Sports Authority and the Electricity Authority where there are people presumably who were previously Government employees, is it that they are not seconded from the Government to the Agency, they started as new employees in the Agency and then their rights in the Government are frozen, pension rights and so on or what are the arrangements?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, they have agreed to leave the Civil Service and to work for a new employer, which is a statutory agency, on terms in a Collective Agreement. One of the terms, as one would expect or otherwise they would not have accepted to leave the employment of the Civil Service, one of those terms is that the Government pension rights are carried forward into the Authorities for the transferring employees. But they cease to be Civil Servants. The hon Member may remember that some time ago I passed an amendment to the Pensions Ordinance to extend it to employees of Government and statutory agencies and authorities.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But in the case of the Elderly Care Agency and the Social Services Agency that regime is not applicable, is it that the Government do not want to do that in those two agencies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, they have different histories. The Sports Authority and the Electricity Authority were two cases in which the Government went to the staff of the whole organisation and said, 'now look, how about breaking this away from the rump of the Civil Service and ring-fencing this particular activity, it remains a public sector activity but how about doing it through the authority?', negotiations ensued, agreements were reached and they are reflected in the Collective Agreements relating to both those organisations. The Social Services Agency has a hugely different history. The Social Services Agency is a bringing together of functions and staff that were scattered in many areas of Gibraltar and in many employers. So for example, it brings together the employees of the ex Dr Giraldi Trust, who were not even public sector employees, they were employees of a private charitable trust. It brings together the people that were subsequently recruited by Milbury as employees of Milbury. It brings together people that used to be employed through the Gibraltar Information Bureau at one stage many years ago. All of those people that have never been Civil Servants are now direct employees of the Social Services Agency. But of course the Social Services Agency as an organisational umbrella includes functions that were and always have been carried out by the Civil Service. For example, social workers or the staff of the Children's Homes the old Bishop Healy Home. Those are career Civil Servants so when their activity was brought under the umbrella of the Social Services Agency, they themselves remained Civil Servants working under the auspices and under the umbrella of the Social Services Agency. So it is not that the Government have never negotiated anything there, it is just a



question of bringing all the activities together for the benefit of the effectiveness of the delivery of the service. Well, the Elderly Care Agency are mostly new recruits as well, but that is the reason why mainly the Social Services Agency has a high number still of Civil Servants, because they are in functions now under the Agency but which used to be staffed by Civil Servants, as opposed to functions now under the Agency that used to be staffed by non-Civil Servants.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the policy to continue that demarcation or are there people who are Civil Servants and people who are not Civil Servants in the Social Services Agency basically doing the same thing or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not believe that there is any mix of function although I would need notice of that question, but generally these things are done on the basis of functions not individuals. Government do not really have a policy on this, for example, if the 39 seconded Civil Servants who are seconded to the Social Services Agency approach the Government and said, 'look, would you enter into discussions with us to transfer two employees of the Agency?', well the Government might sit down and discuss it with them but it is not our policy to require them to do it. I think the thing works quite well, the concept of secondment does not work badly. It is of course something that will have to be considered as the present incumbents die off, would they be replaced by Civil Servants or would they be replaced by Agency employees is an issue which I do not know if it has yet arisen in the Agency. But unless the initiative came from the staff our intention would be to allow those Civil Servants to keep their status if they are happy to.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

On the replacement which the Chief Minister has just mentioned, no decision has been taken at this time, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I personally would need notice of that question. The hon Member asked a moment ago whether there was any cross-fertilisation so to speak within an activity of Agency employees and Civil Servants, I am not quite sure what the answer to that question is. If it is it is very few and would be recruits. If they exist at all yet it would be recruits to fill vacancies left by Civil Servants, but my guess would be that it has not happened because one would then have people doing the same job, working on different pay conditions, which would not be a sustainable position.

ORAL

**NO. 997 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government list the Contract Officers in the G.H.A. that are part of the Civil Service and those that are employed by the Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**HANDOUT TO QUESTION NO.997/2005**

**CONTRACT OFFICERS EMPLOYED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE**

<b><u>GRADE</u></b>	<b><u>NO. OF POSTS</u></b>
CHIEF EXECUTIVE	1
DIRECTOR OF PATIENTS & NURSING SERVICES	1
DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES	1
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH	1
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	1
NURSE LECTURER	1
NURSE PRACTITIONER	2
STAFF NURSE	23
STAFF WIDWIFE	8
REGISTERED SICK CHILDREN'S NURSE	4
REGISTERED MENTAL NURSE	5
THEATRE NURSE	2
OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONER	6
ENROLLED NURSE	4
CONSULTANTS	12
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST	1
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	17
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	7
SENIOR II PHYSIOTHERAPIST	1
SENIOR II OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST	1
SENIOR I OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST	2
MLSO	3
JMLSO (A)	2
SNR I RADIOGRAPHER/MAMMOGRAPHER	1
SNR I RADIOGRAPHER/SONOGRAPHER	1
SENIOR II RADIOGRAPHER	2
RADIOGRAPHER/HELPER	1
SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPIST	1
SENIOR 1 ORTHOPTIST	1
CATERING DIRECTOR	1
COOK (SZ -2)	1

**CONTRACT OFFICERS EMPLOYED BY THE GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY**

<b><u>GRADE</u></b>	<b><u>NO OF POSTS</u></b>
PATIENT COMPLAINTS COORDINATOR	1
G.H.A. CLERK	15
WARD CLERK	5
TYPIST	3
STORES ASSISTANT	1
IT ASSISTANT	1
RECEPTIONIST/HELP DESK OPERATOR	7

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 997 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government explain what is the criteria why it is that some of these contract officers are direct employees of the Health Authority and others are employed directly by the Government as Civil Servants?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot I am afraid. I think that new posts are recruited as GHA contracts but posts that have always been contracted under the Crown continue to be contracted under the Crown. I say that just by looking at the list, that there did not use to be a patient coordinator, the body of clerks, contract clerks that is which is quite unusual, usually clerks are permanent and pensionable so this must be clerks contracted for the functions that have never done this source before, ward clerk is something that is new, that is the only thing that jumps up at me from the page just looking at the list at the bottom of it, as opposed to everything at the top. There may not be a whole amount of science to this.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government say whether in fact there is a particular date? If the answer is that it appears to be newly created posts, has it been happening all the time or is it a more recent development that people are being employed as GHA? This is an issue that in fact I remember raising in previous questions and in 2002 when I was asking for the breakdown for contract officers. The Government were not very clear whether in fact any had been taken on as direct employees of the Authority but I was told at the time that it was a policy that was being considered. So, is there any information as to when this started?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I have not got that information here with me, I suppose it can be obtained. It cannot just be a product of date because even above the list there are some posts which have been created in the last two or three years, just looking down that list. The Catering Director, some of the Radiographer and Mammographer posts, some of the Occupational Therapist posts, I mean those are themselves new posts yet they have been contracted under the Crown. Perhaps the Minister for Health might make a note of the hon Member's interest and write to him to explain what the division is here. I do not think it is about terms to the conditions or rates of pay or anything like that, I think it is just whether the contract is issued by the Crown or whether the contract is issued by the GHA, perhaps if the hon Member is interested in pursuing this he could take it up directly with the Minister.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a nationality requirement in terms of being a Civil Servant?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That cannot be the reason either, this is a polemic issue, Crown employment things go out, persons entitled and it quite actually has tested what the word 'entitled' actually means. But it cannot be that because the Patients Complaint Coordinator, who is a contract officer, is to my certain knowledge a Gibraltarian, so that cannot be the criteria. That person would certainly have been entitled to a contract under the Crown.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a limitation in terms of a contract under the Crown for people who are not British Subjects?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think there is such a limitation, no. Certainly not in law.

ORAL

**NO. 998 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CIVIL SERVANTS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by department and grade of the posts in Government Departments which are currently vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested, and just to avoid misunderstanding between us about how to read this information, the definition as far as the Government are concerned of 'vacant post' is a post for which funding has been provided in the year's estimates but which is not occupied at the moment by a person. That is the definition of 'vacant post'.

**Answer to Question 998/2005**

<b><u>DEPARTMENT</u></b>	<b><u>GRADE</u></b>	<b><u>NO. OF VACANT POSTS</u></b>
EDUCATION	DEPUTY HEADTEACHER - BAYSIDE	1
	TECHNICIAN DESIGN & TECHNOLOGY	1
	CLASSROOM AIDE	2
	EDUCATION WELFARE OFFICER	1
	CLEANER	6
CULTURE	SEO	1
HOUSING	HPTO	1
BUILDINGS & WORKS	HUMAN RESOURCES OFFICER (CONTRACT)	1
	LABOURER	2
TECHNICAL SERVICES	SPTO	1
	HPTO	1
	SEWERMAN	1
	DEPOT WRITER	1
	M/T FITTER (ELEC)	1
	FABRICATION WELDER	1
TRANSPORT - TRAFFIC	AO	1
SOCIAL AFFAIRS	MESSENGER	1
	SOCIAL WORKER	1
	ASST MANAGERESS - ST BERNADETTE'S	1
	CLASSROOM AIDE - SPECIAL NEEDS - ST BERNADETTE'S	2
	CLEANER	2
	SCHOOL ATTENDANT	1
TRADE & INDUSTRY	SEO	1
	SPTO	1
	EO	1
POSTAL SERVICES	S.O.G (EX-SORTER)	1
POLICE	CHIEF INSPECTOR	1
	POLICE CONSTABLE	2
	MARINE MECHANIC	1
SECRETARIAT	HEO	1
	AO	1

**Cont.....**

**Contd Answer to Question 998**

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>GRADE</u>	<u>NO. OF VACANT POSTS</u>
STATISTICS	AO	1
CIVIL STATUS & REGISTRATION OFFICE	AO	1
TREASURY	AO	2
	MESSENGER	1
CUSTOMS	CLEANER	1
INCOME TAX	AO	1
MAGISTRATES	CLEANER	1
GIBRALTAR AUDIT OFFICE	AUDITOR	2
	AO	1
GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY	HOSPITAL ATTENDANT	1



## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 998 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact this list would exclude posts which are shown in the establishment, in the Approved Estimates, if the money has not been included in Personal Emoluments, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, correct. A post cannot be said to exist and therefore cannot be said to be vacant if funding has not provided for it in the Estimates, because it is not possible to fill it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is really a matter of opinion and judgement, because if there is a post shown in the Estimates then the explanations we have been given in the past is that there may not be money for the specific post because when it gets filled it would be towards the end of the financial year, and that has been when we have asked before in Budget debates. The money in the Personal Emoluments is based on the number of posts that it is expected would be filled in that year but my question is, does that explanation imply that there may well be posts that are shown in those Estimates as being part of the establishment.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it does not mean that posts could be shown in the establishment for which no financial provision is then made in the following pages. It could mean that not all the posts shown in the first two pages of each departmental establishment page is not fully funded, because I think it has been explained in the past that there is provision for churn and the time it takes to recruit. So the post may not be fully funded but it is not true that there are posts disclosed in the establishment details for which there is no funding at all. So all the posts that are disclosed on the first two pages of each departmental section of the Estimates are posts which if they were empty would be vacancies.

ORAL

**NO. 999 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – HEALTH CARE REVIEW**

Is it the policy of the Government to separate the GHA from the Civil Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not the policy of the Government to do so. However, the Health Care Review Team has recommended it and the Government are willing to do it, if it can be done by agreement with the staff and if they are happy to discuss and negotiate it.

ORAL

**NO. 1000 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state if there has been any sale of the Government 50 per cent share of co-ownership homes since January 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes there have been and I hand the hon Member a statement giving all the information that he has had in the past about such sales.

**Answer to Question 1000 of 2005**

	SWJG	Montagu Gardens	Westview Park	Harbour Views	Montagu Crescent	TOTALS
Jan-05	Monies Received	£ 43,629.47	£ 143,138.67	£ 91,114.26	£ 32,900.00	£ 402,476.20
Feb-05	Monies Received	£ 26,441.40	£ 24,405.38		£ 23,409.58	£ 74,256.36
Mar-05	Monies Received	£ 56,254.40		£ 22,293.44		£ 78,547.84
Apr-05	Monies Received	£ 61,971.41		£ 20,487.54		£ 82,458.95
May-05	Monies received	£ 98,168.77	£ 39,653.84	£ 94,304.92		£ 232,127.53
Jun-05	Monies Received	£ 73,425.19	£ 31,480.11			£ 104,905.30
Jul-05	Monies Received	£ 31,572.36	£ 37,607.90		£ 46,022.43	£ 115,202.69
Aug-05	Monies Received	£ 65,564.39		£ 66,916.38		£ 132,480.77
Sep-05	Monies Received		£ 86,613.04	£ 41,839.76	£ 16,930.66	£ 145,383.46
<b>Totals</b>		<b>£ 457,027.39</b>	<b>£ 331,418.83</b>	<b>£ 123,173.91</b>	<b>£ 119,262.67</b>	<b>£ 1,367,839.10</b>

**NO. 1001 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government state how many of the Rosia Court properties were sold to 100 per cent bidders and how many to 70 per cent bidders?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Thirty will be sold on a 100 per cent basis and three on a 70 : 30 basis.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1001 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In a recent press release the Government suggested that they would sell four at 70 : 30 ratio.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the decision to limit it to three was not the Government's but rather the result of the selection process. The hon Member will be aware from press statements that there have been two draws. As a result of the first and the second draw process, when the 70 per cent bidders that were in the hat came to choose they did not want the properties that were left and therefore they pulled out, and that is how the four became three, not by any decision to restrict it to three but there are certain buyers who want to buy some properties but not others. Therefore when their name is drawn out of the hat they do not want any of the properties that are left, they pull out and that is how it has happened. We could have sold all 33 to 100 per cent bidders.

ORAL

NO. 1002 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state what was the number of tenders received in respect of each of the fourteen pre-war dwellings offered for sale in the upper town area?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

A total of 123 bids were received for the 13 properties and I hand the hon Member a schedule showing how many were received for each of those properties.

**Answer to Question 1002****Breakdown of bids received in connection with the Upper Town Regeneration Scheme**

<b>Property</b>	<b>No. of bids Received</b>
3 Hargrave's Parade	24
5 Hargrave's Parade	21
27 Castle Ramp	3
3/1 Castle Ramp	13
1 Castle Steps	3
10 Arengo's Palace Site	12
6/4 Devil's Gap Steps	4
6/8 Morello's Ramp	3
9 & 11 New Passage	1
1 Parody's Passage	8
7/9 Richardson's Passage & 5 Castle Steps	5
21 Willis' Passage	5
9 Willis' Road	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>

**NO. 1003 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state to whom and at what price were each of the fourteen pre-war dwellings offered for tender in the upper town area, sold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

All of the 13 properties offered for tender have been awarded, with 10 purchases now proceeding to completion. Details of the successful bidders, together with the value of their bid will shortly be published as usual. I would prefer not to give the information to the hon Member in the House today so that those affected bidders can see it at a time when everybody hears and sees about it at the same time, rather than those who happen to hear or read the report of these proceedings. I should add also that the reason it has not already been published is that three of the bidders decided not to proceed with their purchase post-award, after it had been awarded to them they decided not to proceed with the purchase and in order not to prejudice the allocation of these properties to other bidders for those properties the awards have not yet been made public. But the details of the 10 that have gone through and are not affected by this are about to be published.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1003 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I thought that there was going to be 14 properties for tender and not 13. That is what was said in the press release of 21<sup>st</sup> March, maybe it is a misprint I do not know.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, 9 and 11 New Passage probably count as two. They are properties side by side with separate front doors.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What value is subscribed when these tenders are received to tenderers who as part of the consideration agree to leave a Government property? What value is



subscribed to the leaving of that Government property, or is it really only a cash exercise that the Tender Board looks at?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Usually the surrender of Government property is a factor, and an important one. For example, it will be with the allocation of flats at Waterport Terraces on the basis that if there is somebody living in a Government flat who wants to move to home ownership, that gives the Government the opportunity to solve two people's housing needs, that is to say, the buyer and get a vacant flat. This was a quite unusual disposal process because it was not just a question of the price for the purchase but also the amount of money that the bidder demonstrated he was able to spend in the refurbishment process. Most of these properties are very run down, it would not have been just a question of selling it to the highest bidder. If the highest bidder had spent all his money bidding for the property and then not have had the money to invest, one of the reasons why these properties have been sold cheaply is because they need a lot of money spent on them to bring them up not just as homes but as part of the Urban Renewal Scheme, so it is not quite as simple as the usual allocation process. That said, I am not aware and do not recall that any of these bidders involve surrender of properties. They may have, I have just not focused on the details to that extent. If there was a surrender it would have had a value in the assessment of the properties. It may not have been the determining factor but certainly would have been taken into account because it is standard Government policy to do so.

**NO. 1004 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WATER PORT TERRACES**

Can Government state, of the 1112 applications received by the closing date for the purchase of Water Port Terraces, how many were from applicants who were on the pre-list for housing and how many were from applicants on the housing waiting list proper?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The application form did not require applicants to state whether they are on the housing pre-list nor on the housing waiting list proper. This analysis has not yet been done by Government by comparison of the list of applicants against the housing lists. It will be done but the application forms are now being analysed under various criteria and that analysis is not complete and has not yet reached the stage of comparing it, running it against the housing waiting lists.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1004 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

It is of particular interest to me to know these figures because I would like to establish, as Government call these affordable housing projects, I would like to establish exactly how many people who are waiting for Government housing are able to afford these new properties in Waterport Terraces, and obviously I would like to know as soon as possible what the results of the statistics is.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the hon Member may indeed be interested in seeing who can and who cannot afford affordable housing, but he will not be able to get that information from the answer to his question. There are people on the housing waiting list who can well afford to buy their own homes and there are people who are not on the housing waiting list who cannot afford to buy their own homes. So being on the housing list or not being on the housing list is not really forensic as to the financial disposition of the person concerned. There is information in the application forms designed to arm the Government with a view about the financial disposition of the applicants. The application form, as he will have seen, does ask the applicant to state their income, their jobs and the nature of their employment precisely to give the Government an

opportunity to assess the financial profiles of the people, and indeed that they are able to afford even affordable home ownership. Even affordable home ownership requires a certain level of income, but he will not deduce that to the extent that that is his interest from simply seeing which of the applicants are and which of the applicants are not on the housing waiting list. That information will come from other analyses which we will be happy to share with him when we have it, of the applications.

ORAL

**NO. 1005 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – WATERPORT ESTATE**

Can Government state which was the eminent professional team from UK that designed the Waterport housing estate and how were they selected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1006 to 1008 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1006 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

Can Government state which was the eminent professional team from UK that designed the Waterport housing estate and how were they selected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Question withdrawn.

ORAL

**NO. 1007 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

Can Government state when the UK Waterport housing design team was appointed, when they completed their work and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Question withdrawn.

**NO. 1008 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – WATERPORT ESTATE**

Can Government state when the UK Waterport housing design team were appointed, when they completed their work and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The professional team is composed of HTA Architects John Allen Engineering and Davis Langdon as quantity surveyors. The team was selected by adopting applicable EU Tender procedures. A local board was drawn up, made up of technical staff from different departments and backgrounds to decide on selection which was done through the application of a points system based on experience and expertise with such projects by the various bidders.

The design team was appointed in September 2003 and will complete their work once the hand-over has taken place of the project in 2007. The fee for the design team including design, supervision and project management is £3.1 million.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1005 TO 1008 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When this design team was chosen was it chosen on the basis that they offered the lowest price for doing this work, or were there people offering to do it for less but were not selected?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Under the points system cost is one of the factors. He may think that that is high but actually as a percentage of the project value it is well within the parameters of what design services cost as a percentage of the value of the project that they are engaged with. Sometimes I think that even those of us who trained as lawyers chose the wrong profession.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1009 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – WATERPORT ESTATE**

Can Government specify, giving a breakdown, what was the expenditure to date incurred by GRP Investments Company Ltd in connection with the Waterport housing scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1010 of 2005.



**NO. 1010 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – WATERPORT ESTATE**

Can Government specify, giving a breakdown, what is the expenditure to date incurred by G.R.P.I. Company Limited in connection with the Waterport Housing Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government do not consider it appropriate to give such information at intervals during the execution of the project. Government will be happy to provide a full account of the project upon its completion. In addition, it will also be reflected in the annual accounts of the Company when these are prepared and Tabled.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1009 AND 1010 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government prepared to say whether any payment has been made at all to date?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well yes, there will have been payments made in respect of the design, the design team fees, there will have been payments made in relation to what is called preparatory enabling works, there may have been payments made in respect of geotechnical site survey fees. Whether the first payment has been made on the first certificate under the construction contract I cannot tell him but I doubt it because it is still at the piling stage and I do not think they have been at it for a month yet. Well it would be a month plus the two weeks for certification. I do not think that any of the major construction contract payments will have been made yet. From this point on all certificate payments are to the contractor under the architects certificate under the normal JCT procedure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The payments towards the £3.1 million, would this be something that would be done during the course of the contract or is it something that would be paid either at the beginning or at the end?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Under the standard form of contract for the engagement of design teams, the payments are staggered throughout the contract and payments are made against certain phases as they are called. Even during the design phase there will already have been stage payments, even before a contractor comes anywhere near being appointed. So certainly a significant proportion of that £3.1 million will already have been paid. That will become clear to the hon Member, if he asks for that information in respect of the end of the current financial year then it will be, what I really do not want is to have to be providing accounting by the week or by the month. Certainly if he were to ask it to the end of March then that information would certainly be provided. He will not have to wait until the accounts are prepared, audited and published to get that information, so long as he asks it in relation to a normal accounting period it will be given to him obviously on an un-audited basis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are all the payments in connection with this development being met from GRPI sources or are the Government or any other company involved in making payments?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That decision has not yet been made and decided. It depends on a number of factors, it depends on cash flow, it depends on whether the company has from its own resources the cash flow reserve to make payments, that in turn depends on the flow of payments from buyers and whether they buy 50 per cent or 60 per cent, there are a whole series of things which will determine whether the company and to what extent the company has a funding deficit that it cannot meet from its own resources. Were that to happen, there would have to be recourse to the Improvement and Development Fund, access to the Government Reserves or indeed some other form of borrowing but that is unlikely to happen during this financial year. Remember this contract straddles more than one financial year and certainly we believe the company has enough resources to take it through any expenditure that is likely to arise this financial year for certain.

**NO. 1011 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – WATERPORT ESTATE**

Can Government state what is the anticipated fixed price at which fitted kitchens will be offered to purchasers of flats at the Waterport Estate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This information is not yet available, it is a bit premature for this. If I could just add that there are a series of experiences from which we try to draw, in respect of past home ownership schemes, expenditure that could almost be described as wasted in the sense that the developer would lay a bathroom or floor finish and then the buyers come in, that is not what they want and they rip it all up, but of course they paid for that because it is with the original contract. So all of these things that are not included are the ones that we are told that happens to, and it is really just a way of avoiding the buyer having to pay for it, then pay for the ripping it out, then paying for the purchasing of one that he likes and the installing of the one that he likes. That is the idea and we also think that by the Government centrally negotiating with a series of suppliers prices, that we can actually give the buyers access to kitchens of their choice much cheaper than they would be able to if they all walked in separately into a retailer and said, 'I like that kitchen can I have it?'. That is the idea. It is a huge amount of administrative work but we think it is worth the effort given past experiences.

**NO. 1012 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what professional fees have been incurred in connection with the East Side Development, to whom such fees have been paid, from which source they have been paid and in respect of which financial years?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a table with the information that he has requested on it. The payments have been made to the Gibraltar Land Reclamation Company Ltd, which is the Government's project manager on this, to Triay and Triay who are the Government's lawyers on this project, to Corbett & Co who are a firm of specialist solicitors in the UK that have provided advice on a specific aspect of the matter, and to Mott Macdonald Civil Engineers. The details of the payments which total £842,041 are set out in the schedule. I should also mention that they do not just relate to the East Side development, there is also the Beaches agreements and the infrastructure agreements. The term East Side development includes quite a lot of things and not just the actual development on the East Side.

**Answer to Question 1012 of 2005**

<b>PAID TO</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Gibraltar Land Reclamation Company Limited	£ 59,280.00	£ 83,525.08	£ 319,581.25	£ 462,386.33
Triay & Triay		£ 198,018.85	£ 161,079.22	£ 359,098.07
Corbett & Co		£ 14,002.69		£ 14,002.69
Mott Macdonald Civil Engineers			£ 6,554.15	£ 6,554.15
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>£ 842,041.24</b>
Source of payments - Gibraltar Land (Holdings) Ltd				

**ORAL**

**NO. 1013 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what is the total area of the proposed Eastside development inclusive of the enclosed areas of sea within the additional reclaimed area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1014 to 1017 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1014 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what is the limit in metres from the present edge of the existing Eastside reclaimed area that the developer is permitted to reclaim?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1013 and 1015 to 1017 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1015 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what is the maximum additional land area in square metres that the Developer is permitted to reclaim as an extension to the Eastside reclamation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1013, 1014, 1016 and 1017 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1016 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state at what depth will the maximum reclaimed area be in the permitted extension to the Eastside reclamation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1013 to 1015 and 1017 of 2005.

**NO. 1017 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state whether there is a time limit within which the additional reclamation in the Eastside development has to be completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The exact boundaries of the Development and Marina are the subject of surveys and model testing but is approximately 200,000 square metres.

The location of the proposed marina arm and maximum additional land areas will be determined by the marina surveys currently being carried out as will the maximum depth.

Completion of the required scheme is not later than six years from the grant of the lease of the required scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1013 TO 1017 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the phrase 'completion of the required scheme' mean completion of the reclamation which is what the question was asking, are they the same thing?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we have explained in this House before that under the terms of the agreement entered into with the developers there are certain things that must be done and that is the required scheme. Then there are certain things which they are permitted to do in their own slower order. The things that must be done, which includes the marina, have to be done within six years. I just did not want him to think that the required scheme meant whatever was approved by DPC. Of what is approved by DPC some is mandatory, it has to be done within six years, some of it is not mandatory, in other words they can do it or not in accordance with their commercial judgement, they have got permission to do it and that is not subject to the six year rule.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am asking specifically whether in fact there is a time limit on the reclamation as opposed to anything else they may do. To the reclaiming of land, is that something that they have to do within a certain time limit otherwise they will not be able to do, or have they got all the time in the world?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It works out in that way but not because it is specifically provided for in that way. In other words, they have got to finish the reclamation before the time that they do the arms, they cannot do the marina until they have done the arms, the marina has got to be done within six years, so the effect of all of that in practice is that they have got to have done the reclamation and the marina because the arms of the marina embrace the reclamation.

**NO. 1018 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

What has been the response of the British Government to the letter received from the Spanish Foreign Minister dated 15 June regarding the environmental implications of the Eastside project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The British Government have responded to the effect that the East Side Project is a matter for the Government of Gibraltar and that the environmental aspects are matters for the Laws of Gibraltar which they believe fully transpose applicable EU obligations which are being scrupulously followed. As one would expect them to say.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1018 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether any information on this project has been passed on to the Spanish Government either by the British or by the Gibraltar Governments?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well if it is passed on by anybody it will be by the Gibraltar Government, and the Gibraltar Government are not reluctant and willing to share information with our neighbours, we just wish they would take the same view of sharing information with us. There is a huge number of bigger developments, much more likely to affect the environment of Gibraltar than this one is likely to affect the environment of Spain, for example there is a huge development in Crinavis in the Bay, there is a huge development just in La Linea within swimming distance of Western Beach, reclamations none of which have been notified. Of course there has to be an understanding of what the environmental directives actually say in respect of their cross-border applications. The directives and therefore our law, and presumably their law, does not provide that one has always got to notify ones neighbour. They provide that if the Government believe that it may have significant effect on the environment of ones neighbour then there is an obligation to inform ones neighbour and give them an opportunity to participate in whatever processes are available to ones domestic constituency. That is the extent of it, but of course the question whether they are entitled to any such notification cannot be answered until the

environmental impact assessment report is to hand, because only that report will enable the Minister to assess whether indeed he thinks that there is any possibility of significant environmental effect. So all of this press report in Spain that the law is not being complied with or that the works should stop because Spain's rights are not being respected, are based on complete ignorance of the legal regime that applies to this but once the environmental impact assessment is to hand, if it shows a likelihood or a possibility, a significant possibility of significant impact on the environment of Spain, then of course the Government of Gibraltar will scrupulously comply with our EU obligations, and of course we have no problem about putting information in the public domain which they can benefit from even if it is not a matter of legal obligation to provide it to them. Of course they are going to be pretty hard put to argue that the East Side reclamation is likely to have a significant effect on their environment when implicit in the fact that they have not informed us about their reclamations, implicit in that fact, is the fact that they have taken the view that their reclamations are not likely to have a significant effect on our environment, because if they had not taken that view they would have been under an obligation to provide the information to us and they have not. So either they have breached their obligations if they think their reclamations have a significant or are likely to have a significant effect on our environment, or they are not in breach because they do not think it is capable of having a significant effect, and really some of their reclamations are much closer to us than this one is to them. But these are all technical issues and not political issues as to whether or not it has an effect on their environment, or vice versa.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I understand what the Chief Minister has said in relation to the EIA which will determine whether there will be an impact on the environment. The impression from the quotes attributed to the Spanish Foreign Minister, what they are seeking is to participate in the actual EIA itself. There is one here which quotes Moratinos as having said that what Spain requests, or perhaps requested of the UK, was that they would be given a reasonable period of time in which to indicate whether they wish to participate in the environmental impact assessment. Can the Government confirm whether Spain will participate in any environmental impact assessment into the project, and if so what form does that participation take?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well they are entitled under the directive to ask to participate. In other words, what I have just explained to the hon Member in my last intervention was the obligation of Gibraltar, or if the boot is on the other foot, Spain, to automatically notify ones neighbour. In other words, if Gibraltar does a project and we do an EIA and the EIA indicates, or if for any other reason the Government of Gibraltar believe that this project we want to do in Gibraltar is likely to have a significant effect on the environment in Spain, then we have a legal obligation under EU directives to inform Spain of that information spontaneously, even if they have not asked for it. Under those same directives, Spain also has the right to ask for the information and then we have an obligation to show it to them if there is likely to be material effect on their environment. So again the question cannot be answered until the EIA is to hand. Any suggestion by anybody in Spain, including Mr Moratinos, that Spain might have some other ability to participate, before incidentally anybody else in Gibraltar is able to participate, is simply wrong and I think we have said that publicly and the position in law is as I have just explained it to the hon Member. He also asked what would be the nature of that participatory role, well, the answer is that they are just allowed to

participate in whatever process is established locally for consultation with local constituents. They do not have the right of veto, they do not have the right to prevent the development, they have got the right to ask for details of measures that are planned to reduce whatever might be the envisaged material environmental impact but there is no co-decision. These directives do not abrogate from any Member State to their neighbour any part of the final national sovereign decision to authorise the plans or not.

**NO. 1019 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD - LAND**

What has been the expenditure in the current financial year in the relocation costs connected with the release of MOD Lands?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total expenditure in the current financial year in respect of relocation costs connected with the release of MOD lands is £1,757,192.93.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1019 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this expenditure met from the Improvement and Development Fund?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think this expenditure relates to two projects. The conversion of the properties in North Front, which I think are met from the companies and the MSG reprovion in connection with the works for Coaling Island which I think are met from the Improvement and Development Fund. I think there is a vote for that. Whether all of the money has come from that I would need notice of that question. Certainly I do not think there is any provision in the Improvement and Development Fund for the North Front reconversions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

As I understood it in fact, where the property was going to be producing income from the I&D Fund then the cost of getting that property released was going to be charged to the I&D Fund, is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think there is any hard and fast rule, certainly I think it is right that there should be as much as possible a coincidence of revenue and expenditure so that if

the companies sustain the cost of reprovision, then the fruits of it should go into the company and vice versa in the Improvement and Development Fund. The problem is that these particular costs are not attributable to any particular source of revenue. In other words, in exchange for incurring this expenditure in refurbishing these three or four blocks in North Camp the MOD releases a whole stack of villa type houses and other blocks around Gibraltar, which of course will generate much more capital than this. The real question therefore is not so much matching the revenue and the expenditure in the same place, or putting the revenue and expenditure accounting in the same place but rather who will be the seller of the properties that the MOD transfers to the Government. Are those properties going to be accepted in the companies and sold by the companies, or are they going to be taken by the Government and sold by the Government so that it would be accounted for in the Improvement and Development Fund? My understanding and recollection so far, which I would not want him to rely on without my checking, is that it all happens so far through the Improvement and Development Fund. Such of the villa type properties that are being sold have been done through the Improvement and Development Fund. I see no reason why that should not continue.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think that if the Chief Minister checks he will find that this was confirmed in answer to a previous question. At one stage the Government said that a decision had not been taken and then they came back and confirmed at a subsequent meeting that it was going to be in the I&D Fund.



ORAL

**NO. 1020 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - INVESTMENTS**

Can Government state in respect of tax assessments for the year 2001/2002 what was the estimated total amount of tax payable on income derived from investments in bank deposits and quoted securities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1021 of 2005.

**NO. 1021 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - INVESTMENTS**

Can Government state in respect of tax assessments for 2001/02 what was the estimated amount payable on income derived from investments in bank deposits and quoted securities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I regret I cannot provide the information that the hon Member seeks because the Income Tax Office's computer database does not hold the information segregated in that way and it is simply not possible to access it. We have information about dividends but dividends is not necessary from quoted securities, it could be dividends from private companies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1020 AND 1021 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government have any sort of ball park figure of what the decision that was taken this year that this would no longer be taxable means in terms of previous revenue yield from this source?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, we do not have a scientific figure even on a ball park basis but we do have the views of experienced tax technicians and collectors, tax technicians in the Income Tax Office who believed it is not such that would represent a huge dent in Government revenue. So I cannot tell him that it is going to cost £1 million or £500,000, I cannot tell him the figure, the decision was made on the basis of the assessment by those who are familiar with tax assessments that it would not represent something that would prove unaffordable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it is more likely to be in the hundreds of thousands rather than anything higher than that, on the basis of what the Chief Minister has said.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I think that we have in Gibraltar a tradition of placing our spare cash on deposit elsewhere and then not necessarily, the amount of tax that they say they collect annually from investment income, just to use a generic phrase for all of these things, they say is not huge, is not significant. Whether it is limited to hundreds of thousands, I think it is limited to hundreds of thousands from the conversations, it is very significant a saving for the people affected, in total for the Government it is not a huge cost but of course in terms of the benefits to tax payers it also allows those who have not been able to enjoy the benefit of their nest eggs, because they had put them out of what they thought was the reach of the tax man, they can now sleep comfortably at night, those who are worried about such things, and spend their money in the knowledge that no one is now going to ask them to justify that. So I suppose it will facilitate the repatriation of deposits abroad and that may help some people.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1022 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Based on the 2003/2004 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted to 30 September 2005 what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and number of employees as follows:

1. MOD;
2. Gibraltar Government;
3. Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and
4. Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1023 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1023 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Based on the 2004/2005 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted to 30 September 2005 what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and number of employees as follows:

1. MOD;
2. Gibraltar Government;
3. Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and
4. Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I give the hon Member the answer to the information that he seeks in respect of 2003/2004, given that 504 employers PAYE declarations and certificates for the year 2004/2005 have not yet been returned, any figures produced at this time of PAYE payable would not be accurate enough to give meaningful information of the breakdown of PAYE payable by the different sectors which the information seeks, I would therefore invite the hon Member to seek this information at a Question Time later this year. In other words, I think what the Income Tax is putting on my lips is that there are still so many people that have not submitted that the information really would be meaningless to the hon Member, but there it is in respect of 2003/2004 anyway.

**Answer to Question 1022**

Based on the 2003/04 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 6 October 2005 the information sought is as follows:

	£M	Approximate No. of Employees/Deduction Cards
(a) MOD	4.7	2650
(b) Gibraltar Government	22.3	6350
(c) Government Owned & Joint Venture Companies	3.0	650
(d) Private Sector Employment	<u>34.4</u>	<u>17750</u>
	<u>64.4</u>	<u>27400</u>

**Answer to Question No. 1023**

Given that 504 Employers' PAYE Declaration and Certificates for the tax year 2004/2005 have not yet been returned, any figures produced at this time of PAYE payable would not be accurate enough to give meaningful information of the breakdown of PAYE payable by the different sectors which the Question seeks. I would therefore invite the hon Member to seek this information at a later Question Time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1022 AND 1023 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

On previous occasions at this time of the year what the Tax Office has found was that they were not able to provide the number of employees but they were able to give the figures for the amounts. Is it that the non return this year is higher than in other years?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not recall whether he has ever got a meaningful answer to the same question at this stage in respect of the year just ended. Implicit in the answer that has been given to me is the fact that he has not because otherwise logically he should have had the same answer as he has had now in respect of 2004/2005 in previous years, to the extent that he has had answers to similar questions so soon after the end of the tax year in the past, I cannot remember whether he has or he has not, but to the extent that he has then this answer would imply that it is higher than normal. I do not know whether he can remember offhand whether he has ever had it at this stage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My recollection is, as I have said, that they were not able to give the breakdown of employees at this time of the year but they were able to give certainly the MOD, the Gibraltar Government, the Joint Venture Companies and perhaps a figure for the private sector which was not the final figure.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suggest the hon Member waits until the next Question Time which is bound to be before the end of this year.

ORAL

**NO. 1024 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Can Government provide the breakdown by Paying Officers of Government Employee Deduction Cards in the Tax year 2003/04?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1024**

EMPLOYERS REF	PAYING OFFICES	NO. OF DEDUCTION CARDS 2003/04
G004	Education Department	155
G010	Gibraltar Health Authority	723
G011	Industrial Employees	737
G012	Pensioners (Treasury)	1442
G013	Royal Gibraltar Police	243
G015	Post Office	94
G018	Treasury	1771
G024	Employment & Training Board	336
G026	Overseas' Pensioners (Treasury)	358
G317	Gibraltar Development Corporation	187
E149	Elderly Care Agency	142
S416	Social Services Agency	<u>153</u>
		6341
		====



ORAL

**NO. 1025 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of Company Tax collected in each month since March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1026 of 2005.

**NO. 1026 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1025**

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since March 2005 is:

<b>2005</b>	<b>£M</b>
April	2.5
May	0.8
June	0.9
July	1.0
August	0.4

**Answer to Question No. 1026**

The PAYE Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since March 2005 is:

<b>2005</b>	<b>£M</b>
April	5.8
May	6.1
June	6.3
July	6.4
August	5.6

**ORAL**

**NO. 1027 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at end September 2005 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/96 to 2003/04 had been assessed for Company Tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1028 and 1029 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1028 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at end of September 2005 how many companies had been assessed by the Commissioner of Income Tax without having made a return of taxable profit;

1. above £35,000; and
2. below £35,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1027 and 1029 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1029 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at end of September 2005 how many companies have declared taxable profits:

1. above £35,000; and
2. below £35,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1029****Answer to Question 1027**

	1995/96 £m	1996/97 £m	1997/98 £m	1998/99 £m	1999/00 £m	2000/01 £m	2001/02 £m	2002/03 £m	2003/04 £m
Assessed	15.8	15.6	19.8	25.8	89.0	27.6	30.7	35.6	34.6
Discharged	<u>5.8</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>75.2</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>15.8</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>11.9</u>
	10.0	10.5	10.6	14.8	13.8	13.4	14.9	16.8	22.7
Paid	<u>9.5</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>14.4</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>14.1</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>20.6</u>
Outstanding	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
No of Companies	1446	1418	1467	1459	1544	1576	1526	1490	1451

**Answer to Questions 1028 and 1029**

Year of Assessment	Assessments Based on Returns		Assessments Issued in the Absence of Returns		Total
	Under £35,000	Over £35,000	Under £35,000	Over £35,000	
1998/99	486	79	769	42	1376
1999/00	738	100	588	33	1459
2000/01	1109	135	312	10	1566
2001/02	1275	147	340	14	1776
2002/03	1196	146	405	32	1779
2003/04	1028	139	506	48	1721

ORAL

**NO. 1030 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government now confirm whether the additional amount of company tax collected in March 2005 from one particular tax payer was previously included as unpaid arrears?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1031 of 2005.

**NO. 1031 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government say whether the amount collected in company tax in March 2005 as a result of the settlement of the difference of opinion as to the appropriate tax treatment related to the tax payable over a number of tax years and if so give a breakdown of the number of years and the relevant amount or the total amount if the liability accrued only in one year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I can confirm that the revenue collected was not in settlement of arrears. The hon Member may have misinterpreted the information already provided on this matter at the last House of Assembly meeting. For the sake of clarity, and I hope it does that, I can inform him that resolution of the dispute resulted in the quantification and settlement of tax liabilities for the years up to 2003/2004. The tax arising from the settlement was not paid in March 2005 as the hon Member appears to assume.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1030 AND 1031 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not that I presume things, it is that I was told that. When there was a figure of collection for March 2005, which I think came to something like £10 million, the Chief Minister explained that this was because of a settlement of a dispute over the correct tax treatment which involved, I believe he mentioned, the Banking Institution and this was the explanation given for the fact that the outturn for the year was something like £27 million instead of £17 million. When I asked him in a previous question whether it was included in the arrears or not he told me that he did not think so but that he was not sure. So that is why I have put the question again not because I did not understand the previous answer. Can I ask him in fact, if it has been for tax due in tax years up to 2003/2004 is the amount reflected in the sums paid in the answer to Question No. 1027 which he has just given me?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, we have to be a bit careful here because of course this information relates specifically to one taxpayer and it is deductible, so we have just got to be a little bit careful. I do not mind giving him numerical information but it is a pretty well known



case and people can quite easily identify the taxpayer in question. I think the confusion may be down to this, that it was not until that dispute in respect of earlier years was settled that subsequent tax years could be settled and paid off. So what has happened is that there was a settlement in respect of the years up to 2003/2004, that resulted in the payment of a sum of money, £2.1 million, and that was paid in September 2003. That enabled future years to be settled because one has a dispute about how one deals with certain things, it sort of makes everything else back up in effect to future years, and following the settlement the bank then paid in December 2004 a substantial amount in respect of its then more current non-disputed in the sum of £2.6 million. So, £2.1 million was paid in September 2003 and that related to the settlement in respect of the historical years. Then £2.6 million was paid in December 2004, so that would have fallen in the year ended March 2005 but that did not relate to the disputed years, it was facilitated by the resolution of the dispute relating to the disputed years but it did not itself relate to the settlement of the dispute, and that was paid in December 2004.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What was paid in March 2005 then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it was not March 2005, it was in the year to March 2005. The amount paid in December 2004 is in the year to March 2005. It was not actually paid in March I do not think, well this is what I am being told. The payments were in September 2003 and in December 2004.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then the fact that there was an unusually high collection in March has nothing to do with this, because that is the explanation I recall having been given before.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it is down to this up to March 2005.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not saying up to, I am saying in March.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, sorry, the answer to the last supplementary is yes. It cannot be down to this.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I have asked the Chief Minister the equivalent of the answer that he has just given me about the collection month by month there was a very high figure for March and that is when he first gave me this explanation.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Apparently it is not the explanation. So he is none the wiser why that figure in March was high.

-----

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just put the record straight referring to the exchanges we had on the £9 million of March in Question No. 1031 and the explanation the Chief Minister gave me about the March 2004 payment? The short delay has given me the opportunity to go back and check Hansard. In answer to Question Nos. 549 and 550 of April 2005, the figure that was given in Corporation Tax showed £10.7 million being collected in March and I asked the Chief Minister whether this reflected a higher level of collection of arrears or a higher level of profits being assessed. His reply was, 'no, this is something that we are referring to in the debate on the Estimates. It is a one-off payment due, the largest one to a long-standing dispute between one particular taxpayer, a bank, and the Commissioner of Income Tax going back several years as to the proper tax treatment of certain transactions'. This is precisely what I was saying to him in the exchanges. It is quite obvious, given what he has told us today, that that explanation that was given in April is totally incorrect. Does he know therefore what the correct explanation is for the £10 million collected in March?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There can therefore be no extraordinary reason for it. The original question is the suggestion that there was something extraordinary.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The extraordinary thing about it was that it was £10 million in March and £2 million in February. Therefore, five times or four and a half times as large and the Chief Minister told me that we should not regard this as an indicator of any trend because there was an explanation that was unusual, because it was a one-off payment that came in that date. In fact, he has just told us today that the one-off payment came in December, so the December figure which was £3.1 million is the one that needs to be corrected for the extraordinary payment and not the March one. Obviously he can expect me to ask again at the next meeting.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will find out what was the reason, if any, for March 2005 being £10 million? It was an extraordinary payment, unusually high.

-----

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I said I would come back on the question of the £8 million providing the Chief Minister with the information. In the Approved Estimates for the year 2004/2005 he will find that in the column which shows the Actual Expenditure of 2002/2003, on page 24, it has got Consolidated Fund Charges and there is Public Debt Repayment £8 million for that year. This is also shown on page 28 which gives the summary of Consolidated Fund Charges and it is also included in the total Consolidated Fund Expenditure for that year of £165,487,718, which is on page 25, so the payment out of the Consolidated Fund to repay £8 million of public debt is actually in three different places in the Estimates of that year, and I have made a photocopy of it for him, and he will find that the Revenue went into the Improvement and Development Fund and that is shown in the Annex as Sale of Government Properties and is part of an amount of £10 million plus. The way that it was done was that the Government instead of making a contribution from the Consolidated Fund Reserve to the I&D, put the money from the sale of property in the I&D and used the money that would have gone into the I&D to repay the debt, which is in line with the explanation I gave before and I am sure he is happy to see it black upon white rather than take my word for it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What that clearly shows is that there was a public debt repayment which features here. It does not address the point of whether a transaction whereby public debt is swapped one for the other without any money having gone into the Consolidated Fund, falls to be dealt with in the same way which was a substantive point we were discussing. We were also discussing this one, and this clearly shows that there was a public debt down payment, it would have been drawn out subsequently, because I do not recall in that year there being an actual £8 million reduction in public debt, that must be that money was used to pay down debt, albeit temporarily, which was in one of the funds that require appropriation. Now, in the case that we were discussing with the supplementary that he asked, yes, whether the conversion of the payment down of revolving debt to the bank from the proceeds of the issue of Government Debentures would need to be treated in the same way. That was the original issue discussed. My view is, these things are decided by the Accountant General, but my view is that provided the money does not go into the Consolidated Fund, the hon Member said, 'yes but does the Borrowing Powers Ordinance not require the proceeds of Debentures to be paid in?', I do not know that I would have to check that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

First of all it is not appropriated as he has just said. Secondly, I did not say the proceeds I said the repayment, that is to say, what I said to him was that when there used to be a Sinking Fund one could repay debt out of the Sinking Fund. Since there is not one, and he will remember because he said that it does not matter because it

will now be a charge on the Consolidated Fund. The charge on the Consolidated Fund is both the servicing of the debt and the repayment of the principal. On page 24 it says quite clearly, in 2002/2003 Recurrent Consolidated Fund Charges £24 million and then Public Debt Repayment £8 million. Now when I pointed that out to him before without the benefit of having the book in front of me, he said I had got it all wrong because how could the £8 million have gone into the I&D Fund and also been used for debt repayment, that is what he said. I am sure the record shows that. Therefore, I have taken the trouble to get it so that I could explain to him how it was that it was possible that the £8 million appears in two places. It appears as Revenue in the Improvement and Development Fund. That revenue stream.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Relieved the Consolidated Fund of £8 million worth of funding.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is right, and the £8 million that would have gone into the I&D instead went to repay the £8 million debt and that is where the debt repayment came. Therefore, in the question that I put to him initially was, well look, if one is repaying for example Barclays Bank and issuing Debentures, is this being done on the basis that will be reflected in the Estimates as the money from the Debentures having been credited to the Consolidated Fund Reserves and the repayment to Barclays Bank having been paid from the Consolidated Fund Reserves, that was my original question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That was the question we are now focusing on querying whether the proceeds of the debentures are monies being received into the Reserve. The Consolidated Fund Reserve has taken over from the Sinking Fund. The Accountant General has determined that the Consolidated Fund Reserve is the Consolidated Fund, we might want to call it the Reserve but it is the Consolidated Fund, and therefore once money goes into the Consolidated Fund Reserve, it is subject to appropriation or to Consolidated Fund Charge. In other words, it has to come out of the Consolidated Fund by one of the two routes that money can come out of the Consolidated Fund, either Consolidated Fund Charge or appropriation. In other words departmental appropriation, and that is what happened with the £8 million, that is exactly what happened, the proceeds of sale is exactly as the hon Member says. Now, all that said, we now have a situation where as a matter of Treasury management debt from the banks is being paid down from the proceeds in effect of new money being borrowed from Debenture holders. The question is, does the proceeds of money from the Debenture holders enter the Consolidated Fund Reserve so that it then can only come out of the Consolidated Fund Reserve in one of the two authorised ways? If the answer to that question is yes, then it would have to be shown in the same way as this. If the answer is no, then it would not because it would not have been in the Consolidated Fund Reserve and therefore the exit from it would not have to be reflected here. So the issue left between us, I am not sure that there is an issue between us, I am not sure in the way he has expressed the question.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I wanted to know which it was.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I see. So the issue is, is this just a matter of Treasury management, in other words, money comes in from the Debentures and the Treasury Accountant General just sends it along to the bank which is what I suspect the position is, or is this payment down of debt followed by incurring of new debt from a different source, which I am not certain whether that is what the hon Member was suggesting it should be or simply asking which of the two it was. My own supposition at this stage is that it is not to be dealt with in this way. In other words, that when the Treasury obtains proceeds from the issue of Debentures, that that can be used to pay down public debt without it coming through in this way, but it is an interesting question and I will check the answer and certainly confirm it to him. The reason why I said that I thought that that would be the case was because otherwise every time that there was movement on the Revolving Debt, it would fall to be dealt with in the same way. Then the hon Member said would that not depend on whether it was a different bank. I really do not think it can turn on things of that nature but that is the issue here. I will find out the answer.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1032 OF 205**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST (NO. 2) PENSION SCHEME**

Have any additional employers joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Three additional employers have joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since March 2005. They are as follows:-

GRP Investments Company Ltd  
Europa Incinerator Ltd  
Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Ltd.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1032 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the case of GIC that had their own pension scheme, I take it that that is because they transferred to this one and the other one is now discontinued, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think it relates to a new employee, the old scheme is for those who were there.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1033 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12B**

Can Government state how much of the £150,000 provided in Head 12B as a contingency in the Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance 2004/05, has been reallocated to other Heads of Expenditure giving a breakdown by Head and date of reallocation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1039 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1034 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPUTERISED AUDIT SYSTEM**

Can Government explain what is the nature of the new Computerised Audit System provided as a result of the funds re-allocated by Warrant No. 6 of 22 April 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1035 of 2005.



**NO. 1035 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPUTERISED AUDIT SYSTEM**

Can Government state when and to whom payment was made in respect of the introduction of a new Computerised Audit System for the Audit Office?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The funds vired by Reallocation Warrant No. 6 of 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2005 were for the purpose of procuring a new computerised audit management system for the Gibraltar Audit Office.

The computerised audit management system, purchased from Price Waterhouse Coopers in the United Kingdom by payment of an initial licence fee on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005, consists of a windows-based electronic management system that automates all phases of the audit process. This computer application converts all aspects of the audit work papers (that is, planning, preparation, review, report generation and storage) into an electronic format thereby making the information easily accessible to audit staff. It is called Team Mate in case he is interested.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1034 AND 1035 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So effectively, it is for the purchase of a computer programme?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the licence fee element was £11,457.73 which was initiated by licence fee. It is a programme not hardware, there may be some hardware there too, I do not know whether they had enough hardware to run this or not, but certainly the main cost would have been software.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this payment of the licence fee a one-off payment or is there any recurring element?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him but it would be most unusual if it was not recurring. Usually these licence arrangements involve annual payments.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably then, if it involves recurring payments that would now be reflected in the existing Estimates, given that the last time it was vired presumably because it had not been planned for?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that must be right. It was vired to the Audit Office not the computer department. Yes, then it would appear in the computer section's other charges vote I suppose.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1036 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**AUDIT OFFICE – EX-GRATIA PAYMENT**

Can Government state to whom and in respect of what a £14,000 compensation payment was made by the Audit Office in 2004/05?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

An ex-gratia payment amounting to just under £14,000 was made to a contracted officer of the Gibraltar Audit Office on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005 as a result of his termination of contract.

Under the terms of the contract there was no provision for a gratuity payment to be effected on termination. Nevertheless, it was decided that an ex-gratia payment would be effected equivalent to 10 per cent of the officer's salary during the time he was in employment in the Audit Office in recognition for his services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1036 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say how long he was in employment?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He was in employment from 19<sup>th</sup> February 2001 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1037 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12 SUBHEAD 1(b)**

Can Government state what is the amount included in Head 12B Supplementary Funding in respect of services previously provided by Gibraltar Community Projects Limited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1038 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1038 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12 SUBHEAD 1(b)**

Can Government state what sums, if any, have been reallocated to date to other Heads of Expenditure from Head 12B as a result of the proposed re-organisation of Community Projects Limited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The sum of £2 million was provided for under Head 12 Subhead 1(b) Supplementary Funding for Gibraltar Community Projects Ltd, which is due to be reorganised in the current financial year. As at Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October no monies have yet been reallocated.

**NO. 1039 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**F & DS OFFICE**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £45,000 additional expenditure provided in the Financial and Development Secretary's Department by Supplementary Funding Warrant No. 8 of 22 April 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Of the £150,000 contingency in the Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance for the last financial year £55,600 has been utilised. In Reallocation Statement No. 12 of 2004/2005 the sum of £20,000 was vired into Pay Settlements to fund the payments contained in Pay Settlements Statement No. 13. A further £35,600 was reallocated through Supplementary Funding Statement No. 14.

The reallocations contained in Statement Nos. 12, 13 and 14, which contain the required breakdown by Head and Subhead of expenditure, were effected on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2005 and laid before the House on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2005.

With regard to the £45,000 reallocation by Supplementary Funding Warrant No. 8 the breakdown is as follows:

- £38,400     -     Regrading of the Senior Executive Officer to Senior Officer effective from August 2002 and settled in March 2005
- £6,600     -     Secretarial cost under provision
- £1,000     -     Administrative Officer Promotion (I think it was the promotion of a Secretary to Administrative Officer).

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1033 AND 1039 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this regrading of a Senior Executive Officer to Senior Officer a post that is shown as personal to holder in the Estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot remember exactly when this was done. I think this was done, the Warrant was 22<sup>nd</sup> April but if it was done before the Estimates were drawn up for this year it will now be shown as a Senior Officer. It had not historically been shown as a Senior Officer. I just have not got a copy here and I do not know how it is shown this year, but I think that if this was done before the Estimates booklet was prepared, I do not think it was because it says here it was settled in March 2005, the Estimates booklet may have been printed by then. So it is just a question of looking, there is no other Senior Officer in that area, if it shows a Senior Officer now it is this. If it does not show a Senior Officer then it has not yet been reflected in the Estimates.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The amount of money is because it is backdated to 2002, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1040 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**IMPORT DUTY**

Can Government state what was the revenue yield in the financial year 2004/05 of the increases in import duty introduced on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2004 in Legal Notice No. 50 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Around £3.7 million.

I personally have not checked the items to which Legal Notice No. 50 referred, I assume it referred to a variety of items and not just to one, because the information I have given him relates to a variety of items and not just to one. I have not checked because the answer specifically says Legal Notice No. 50 of 2004 and I just wanted to guard against the possibility that the person who has put this answer together may have assumed that that related to all the duty increases announced at that time. It is a variety of items.



ORAL

**NO. 1041 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of September 2005, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1042 to 1045 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1042 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government now state what is the final figure for Government Deposits in the On-Call Investment Account with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1041 and 1043 to 1045 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1043 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government now state what is the final figure for non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1041, 1042, 1044 and 1045 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1044 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government state what is the final figure for interest paid on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1041 to 1043 and 1045 of 2005.

**NO. 1045 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government state how much of the £50 million replacement loan stock issued in May was initially held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank and what movement has there been from this initial holding since that date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1041 of 2005**

The value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005 is as follows:

Monthly Income Debentures	£30,440,100
Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures	£66,692,100

**Answer to Question No. 1042 of 2005**

The Government deposits held in the On-Call Investment Accounts with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 is £53.82 million.

**Answer to Question No. 1043 of 2005**

The non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 is £159.41 million (this excludes accrued interest).

**Answer to Question No. 1044 of 2005**

The interest paid on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank in the financial year 2004/2005 is £8.5 million.

**Answer to Question No. 1045 of 2005**

Of the £50 million replacement debentures issued, the sum of £10 million was initially held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank. The hon Member will note that the Gibraltar Savings Bank actually held £10 million of the maturing loan stock.

The £10 million Gibraltar Savings Bank holding of Gibraltar Government Debentures was redeemed within a few days. However, the public debt remained at the same level as this £10 million redemption was replaced by Government Debentures issued directly to the public.

No Government Debentures have been held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1041 TO 1045 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the initial explanation, the Chief Minister will recall, was that in fact the Bank was going to be issued with the bulk of the new replacement stock which would then sort of be run down as it was sold to other people, but that has only happened to the extent of £10 million, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How was it done? Was it done by the Savings Bank actually reselling to the public or the Savings Bank getting repaid and then the Treasury selling to the public, does he know which?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can find out for him. I am guessing but I think it would have been done directly, not through the agency of the Savings Bank. It is the same staff but as a matter of structure it would not have been done through the accounts.

**NO. 1046 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**REVOLVING LOAN FACILITIES**

Can Government state what has been the amount of outstanding Government debt in respect of the revolving loan from local banks at the end of each month in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule setting out the information.

**Answer to Question 1046 of 2005**

The amount of outstanding Government debt in respect of the revolving loan from local banks at the end of each month in the current financial year is as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Barclays</b>	<b>Natwest</b>	<b>Total</b>
April 2005	£20,000,000	£23,000,000	£43,000,000
May 2005	£20,000,000	£18,000,000	£38,000,000
June 2005	£15,000,000	£15,000,000	£30,000,000
July 2005	£15,000,000	£12,000,000	£27,000,000
August 2005	£15,000,000	£10,000,000	£25,000,000
September 2005	£10,000,000	£10,000,000	£20,000,000

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1046 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

To the extent that the movement in the debt owed to the bank is a reflection of what I think was indicated initially, of the replacement of bank debt by debenture sales, is the mechanism that the proceeds of the debenture goes into the Consolidated Fund and then the Consolidated Fund will eventually show in the Estimates debt repayments of this? Does the Chief Minister know?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not get too personally involved in Treasury management issues of this sort, the policies are cleared with me. My understanding is that debt payments and repayments are dealt with outside the Consolidated Fund in terms of revenue, and the revenue and expenditure part of the Consolidated Fund we both know that there is a separate account of movements in public debt so that the repayment of revolving loans, I cannot remember now whether the repayment of the revolving loans may be shown as repayments and the debentures may be shown as new borrowings with a net position. I am just trying to remember whilst I am on my feet whether it goes into that degree of detail in the Estimates or the account, or whether it just shows a net position. Net repayments and net new borrowings I think, it is netted I think so it would not show it. It will show the figure from the banks down and the figures from debentures up, but mechanically it does not go through the revenue part of the account. This is not subject to appropriation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Surely it must go through the Consolidated Fund charges which is not voted by the House but which is legally where the liability for debt repayment lies.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it was done below the line.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not believe so, I think perhaps if the Chief Minister will recall that when the £8 million was paid off as a result of the resale of Europort, that was shown in the Government Estimates for that year as a debt repayment out of the Consolidated Fund charges.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It was reflected in the Improvement and Development Fund as I recall. This is all from memory, I would have to check the records. My recollection is that capital repayments are not reflected in the annual budgetary situation, as opposed to servicing cost, interest costs which are. So the interest element of debt financing is a Consolidated Fund charge but I do not remember the capital part of it being too but I



would have to just check that. Perhaps this is in one of those accounts that we added at the end, there is a reserve head now at the end of the booklet. The repayment I do not think is recurrent expenditure and I do not think the new borrowing is recurrent revenue, if that is the question that he is asking.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware that it is not money that is appropriated by the Appropriation Ordinance of the House because just like legal aid is not appropriated by the Appropriation Bill of the House it is a direct charge on the Consolidated Fund, and the servicing of the national debt is a direct charge. But so is the repayment of expiring debt. Presumably, for example, at some point the fact that on 1<sup>st</sup> May we repaid the £50 million quoted loan stock of the Government of Gibraltar, that will appear in the accounts as having been repaid, I imagine, as a Consolidated Fund charge since there is no longer a Sinking Fund to pay off debt because the Chief Minister decided it was not necessary when he came in 1996, which is where it used to be done.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not believe the hon Member is right, we are discussing things of which I do not have notice and so subject to correcting myself if I say something from memory that is not correct, I believe that there is a statement of public debt which shows the movements during the year and the statement in relation to the Consolidated Fund simply relates to recurrent revenue and recurrent expenditure. I think this is dealt with outside of the recurrent statement, particularly in this case where there is no net reduction, it is just a question of switching one debt instrument for another. If the hon Member was right, every time a revolving loan was paid down and then redrawn, which is what revolving loans are, it would have to be similarly reflected and it is not, and the revolving loan is not new, it has been around five years.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I imagine it would have to be reflected if it was between different lenders but not the same lender.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I will find out whether the £8 million is shown and bring it to the Chief Minister's attention before the day is over.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The £8 million was something different. The £8 million was not debt, the £8 million was proceeds of sale of a Government building to the Royal Bank of Scotland, which was reflected as £8 million worth in the Improvement and Development Fund, as I

remember, not debt, and it was then credited, I do not know whether it was then credited to the Consolidated Fund Reserve or whether it was used as revenue to fund the Improvement and Development Fund that year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can tell him. It went into the Improvement and Development Fund because it was the proceeds of the sale of a building, but the repayment of the £8 million to the bank was shown under Consolidated Fund charges right at the beginning of the book, in the table that there is showing that the debt had gone down by £8 million as a result of £8 million being repaid. I will find the book and the year and bring it to his attention before the day is over because I remember it very clearly.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In the public debt section?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, in the Consolidated Fund charges where the Governor's pay is, the legal aid is, the interest charged, that is where it was.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He will have to show it to me. There is a public debt repayment done in the Consolidated Fund charges.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So what I am asking is presumably that in this year will have to show.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Which is funded from this new Consolidated Fund Charge Reserve Head that we established, which is Head 8 under Consolidated Fund Charges, Recurrent Consolidated Fund Charges in the book. Then in the summary of Consolidated Fund Charges under the heading 'reserve' and the new Head 8 appears below the word 'reserve' it says public debt repayment, which has been zero for years and it will be zero and it will only stop being zero to the extent that there was a net reduction. The issue that we are debating is whether the revolving element, in other words, changing one form of public debt for another in a way that does not affect the net figure, whether those movements would be reflected here or not, and I believe the answer to that is no. Net movements would be reflected.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister is saying the year that the £8 million appeared there was because the debt went down by £8 million, that is the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, either that or that the money had gone into an account for the spending of which the House's appropriation was required. In other words, if the money is the proceeds of sale of a Government property and it goes into the Improvement and Development Fund, and it is then used to pay down debt.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the money went into the Improvement and Development Fund and was used for the purposes for which the Improvement and Development Fund is used anyway and appropriated by the House. What I am saying is that without the appropriation of the House there was an item of £8 million charged as a direct cost under Consolidated Fund charges because the Loans Empowering Ordinance says that one repays that debt by charging it to the Consolidated Fund as a direct charge, it is in the law. It is in the law that allows debt to be raised and that is how it was done and that is how it was shown. When I stop with my questions I will be able to find the year and give him a copy.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He is going to have to because the same £8 million cannot both be applied to pay down a public debt and used for the purposes of the Improvement and Development Fund. It could have been used for one or the other but not for both things.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think what the Government did was that they used the £8 million that came in in the Improvement and Development Fund and they charged the £8 million to the reserves of the Consolidated Fund in that particular year, but I will get the book.

ORAL

**NO. 1047 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**BANK CHARGES**

Can Government state what has been the expenditure in respect of bank charges applied to the running of the Government's main bank account in the financial years 2003-4 and 2004-5?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total bank charges applied to the running of the Government's main bank account in the financial years 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 were as follows:

Financial Year 2003/2004	-	£ 56,098.85.
Financial Year 2004/2005	-	£124,794.41.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1047 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take this reflects what was done in the Supplementary Appropriation Bill where there was a reference to additional charges being payable but in fact is it that there is, are we talking about more than double the bank charges, is this a reflection of much more activity by the Government or simply that we are being charged more for the same service?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know, I suspect it is the latter. Certainly there has not been twice as much activity as there used to be.

ORAL

**NO. 1048 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state whether the Treasury has charged a commission on property sales of the Government's share of co-ownership homes in the current financial year and if so the dates, the amounts received and the estates where each of the relevant properties is located?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, consistently with past practice there has been and I am happy to give the information to the hon Member in the form of a schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 1048 of 2005**

	SWJG	Montagu Gardens	Westview Park	Harbour Views	Montagu Crescent	TOTALS
<b>Apr-05</b>	Monies Received	£ 61,971		£ 20,488		£ 82,459
	5% charge paid	£ 3,099		£ 1,024		£ 4,123
<b>May-05</b>	Monies Received	£ 98,169	£ 39,654	£ 94,305		£ 232,128
	5% charge paid	£ 4,908	£ 1,983	£ 4,715		£ 11,606
<b>Jun-05</b>	Monies Received	£ 73,425	£ 31,480			£ 104,905
	5% charge paid	£ 3,671	£ 1,574			£ 5,245
<b>Jul-05</b>	Monies Received	£ 31,572	£ 37,608		£ 48,022	£ 115,203
	5% charge paid	£ 1,579	£ 1,880		£ 2,301	£ 5,760
<b>Aug-05</b>	Monies Received	£ 65,564		£ 66,916		£ 132,481
	5% charge paid	£ 3,278		£ 3,346		£ 6,624
<b>Sep-05</b>	Monies Received	£ 86,613		£ 41,840	£ 16,931	£ 145,383
	5% charge paid	£ 4,331		£ 2,092	£ 847	£ 7,269

	SWJG	Montagu Gardens	Westview Park	Harbour Views	Montagu Crescent	TOTALS
<b>2005/06 Total Monies Received</b>	£ 330,702	£ 163,875	£ 31,480	£ 223,549	£ 62,953	£ 812,559
<b>2005/06 Total 5% charges paid</b>	£ 16,535	£ 8,194	£ 1,574	£ 11,177	£ 3,148	£ 40,628

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1048 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this recently introduced past practice something that is going to be extended to the property sales of the new estate that is being constructed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not thought about it but it is a very good idea, I promise to think about it.

ORAL

**NO. 1049 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of social insurance schedules as at 30th September 2005 in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01, giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the very substantial amount of information that the Question requests.



**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1049/2005**

**SI Returns Statistics as at 30 September 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers <i>all</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers <i>returned</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending			
Qtr.1/01	1236	15091	315	301	1091	10237	266	196	4305	24	25	549	25	80
Qtr.2/01	1246	15459	415	305	1100	10575	342	199	4330	42	25	554	31	81
Qtr.3/01	1261	15728	482	309	1094	10835	399	203	4343	37	25	550	46	81
Qtr.4/01	1268	15510	592	313	1098	10615	516	206	4325	41	26	570	35	81

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2001.

## SI Returns Statistics as at 30 SEPTEMBER 2005

**Note:-** Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002.

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO.1049/2005**

**SI Returns Statistics as at 30 SEPTEMBER 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending			
Qtr. 1/03	1357	16338	393	861	1111	11228	349	618	4549	24	78	561	20	165
Qtr. 2/03	1380	16690	590	853	1117	11475	516	608	4650	47	80	565	27	165
Qtr. 3/03	1391	16824	876	847	1111	11547	803	603	4713	36	79	564	37	165
Qtr. 4/03	1402	16347	1080	855	1108	11115	978	612	4684	48	79	548	54	164

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2003.

**Cont'd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO.1049/2005**

**SI Returns Statistics as at 30 SEPTEMBER 2005**

	All				Private				Official				Self Employed	
	Number of Employers <i>all</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers <i>returned</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr.1/04	1433	15795	750	2234	1108	11091	644	1361	4138	85	687	566	21	186
Qtr.2/04	1453	15499	1237	2236	1102	10853	1072	1361	4075	132	689	571	33	186
Qtr.3/04	1467	15873	1413	2234	1095	11233	1201	1357	4081	147	691	559	65	186
Qtr.4/04	1481	15141	2108	2242	1073	10529	1888	1361	4057	138	694	555	82	187

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2004.

**Cont'd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO.1049/2005**

**SI Returns Statistics as at 30 SEPTEMBER 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers all	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr.1/05	1500	11170	1313	7318	997	8615	1065	4339	2044	231	2665	511	17	314
Qtr.2/05	1518	7448	5700	7286	756	5290	4953	4302	1727	635	2670	431	112	314
Qtr.3/05	1523	2517	11055	7243	127	725	9851	4266	1733	694	2663	59	510	314

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2005.

**NOTE FOR CHIEF MINISTER ONLY – REF QUESTION 1049/2005**

**SI Returns Statistics as at 31 March 2005**

	All				Private				Official				Self Employed				
	Number of Employers <i>all</i>				Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers <i>returned</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending			
Qtr. 1/01	1248	14678	706	397					1068	9889	588	280	4243	87	29	546	31
Qtr. 2/01	1257	15058	809	401				1075	10215	688	282	4293	84	30	550	37	89
Qtr. 3/01	1269	15191	1042	400				1076	10378	869	278	4267	119	33	546	54	89
Qtr. 4/01	1278	14986	1990	619				1072	10134	1860	457	4282	90	35	570	40	127

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2001.

Cont'd - NOTE FOR CHIEF MINISTER ONLY – REF QUESTION 1049/2005

SI Returns Statistics as at 31 March 2005

	All				Private				Official			Self Employed		
	Number of Employers	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr. 1/02	1301	15433	908	646	1076	10527	822	473	4363	51	46	543	35	127
Qtr. 2/02	1319	15522	1013	630	1078	10610	879	457	4366	92	46	546	42	127
Qtr. 3/02	1333	15664	1201	628	1086	10742	1033	455	4365	120	46	557	48	127
Qtr. 4/02	1342	15456	1255	662	1079	10466	1088	488	4437	100	47	553	67	127

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002.

Cont'd - NOTE FOR CHIEF MINISTER ONLY - REF QUESTION 1049/2005

SI Returns Statistics as at 31 March 2005

	All				Private				Official			Self Employed		
	Number of Employers	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr. 1/03	1370	15552	1005	1156	1069	10518	916	846	4523	55	97	511	34	213
Qtr. 2/03	1395	15895	1267	1136	1071	10763	1145	826	4619	82	97	513	40	213
Qtr. 3/03	1409	15487	2160	1128	1051	10310	2016	820	4662	95	95	515	49	213
Qtr. 4/03	1422	15341	2075	1134	1054	10180	1922	828	4661	86	95	500	67	211

Note:-

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2003.



Cont'd - NOTE FOR CHIEF MINISTER ONLY - REF QUESTION 1049/2005

SI Returns Statistics as at 31 March 2005

	All				Private				Official			Self Employed		
	Number of Employers				Number of Employers returned				Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr.1/04	1447	14470	1392	3263	1029	10017	1216	2162	3912	149	882	541	27	219
Qtr.2/04	1470	13857	2311	3250	1004	9475	2054	2149	3876	179	882	506	78	219
Qtr.3/04	1491	13639	3183	3233	975	9305	2820	2136	3848	247	878	486	116	219
Qtr.4/04	1506	12244	4710	3242	882	7933	4357	2141	3852	200	882	459	153	219
Qtr.1/05	1518	4690	1467	14281	419	2674	1299	10645	1787	154	3036	229	14	600

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1050 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY – PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state how much has been collected in Stamp Duty at the lower rate on Property Sales in each month since the new stamp duty on Property Sales came into effect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1051 of 2005.

**NO. 1051 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY – PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state how much has been collected in Stamp Duty at the higher rate on Property Sales in each month since the new stamp duty on Property Sales came into effect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The short answer to the hon Member's question is that the new Stamp Duty on property sales announced in the Budget has not yet come into effect. It requires primary legislation which has not yet been debated in this House but which we hope to bring it shortly, and therefore it is still being applied at 1.26 per cent across the board. In case he is interested in the information I do not mind giving him the answer to his question, namely, how much Stamp Duty has been collected.

**Answer to Question 1051 of 2005**

**Financial Year 2005/2006**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Amount</b>
April 2005	£209,330.89
May 2005	£149,364.53
June 2005	£168,513.00
July 2005	£140,711.49
August 2005	£163,572.50

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1050 AND 1051 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I seem to remember that in answer to a past question the Chief Minister told me that there were Stamp Duties for different things connected with property, is this figure that he has given me just for sales? I think he mentioned to me that when I was analysing the figures previously I might have been misinterpreting it because it was not just for the sale of a property but for other things that also bore Stamp Duty.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have to admit I was having the same thought as I was reading the answer myself. I do not know, I hope so because it would be pretty illogical for somebody to have offered this information if it had nothing whatsoever to do with the question asked which relates to property sales. I dare not confirm it to him because this is not my handiwork, so I will confirm to him whether this relates only to collections of sales as opposed to other dutiable property transactions.

**NO. 1052 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU PENSIONERS**

Can Government now state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with monthly residence permits, how many such persons currently have such permits and under which provision of the Immigration Control Ordinance have such permits been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I gave the answer to this question in my reply to Question No. 565 of 2005 at the meeting of this House held on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2005. The only change since then has been that whereas at that time the number of unemployed non-EU pensioners who held six monthly permits stood at 60, this has now risen to 64.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1052 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the question that I put was not in fact answered, because the Chief Minister did not tell me then under which provision of the Immigration Control Ordinance it had been issued when the policy was introduced, and just told me how many people currently had such permits which is the figure which he has updated now. I think the rest of the information was not provided at the time, I think in the exchanges that took place he referred to perhaps not having put the right wording originally and that is why this time the question says 'now', in case he is now in a position to give me the information he was not able to give me six months ago.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the hon Member misses the point of the answer that he has just had, and indeed therefore, also the point of the answer that he had back in April. The question is predicated on a false premise and that is, when was the policy introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with monthly residence permits? The answer that he got back in April was that there is no policy under which non-EU pensioners are provided with monthly residence permits. Therefore, there are no such persons who currently hold monthly permits and he has had the same answer and therefore the information that he has had are people who get permits other than monthly. The whole purpose of his question is to establish when was the policy introduced to issue,

in effect, Moroccan unemployed pensioners with monthly, they are not issued with monthly. Therefore there is no such policy and therefore the question under what section of the Ordinance it is done does not arise. It is not that the information was not given, it is that the premise of both his questions does not reflect the position as it is operating. They do not get monthly permits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well what is the length of the permits they get to enable them to register as unemployed in order to be able to remain in residence in Gibraltar and collect their pensions? This all arises because he revealed in a discussion we had on a totally different subject that this was a policy they had just introduced and I have been trying to establish the nature of the policy ever since.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They are not issued with monthly, the answer that he got back in April was that there was a total of 32 male non-EU pensioners over the age of 65 and 46 female pensioners over the age of 60, in other words of pensionable age men and women, who were in possession of annual residence permits. Then I went on to tell him that there is no policy under which such people are provided with monthly residence permits, which was the premise of his question. The answer communicated to him was that they were in possession of annual permits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When was that policy of giving them annual permits then introduced, if that was the policy?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Does he mean on what date?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It all arises because the Chief Minister announced in the House that they had introduced this new policy to enable non-EU nationals, predominantly Moroccans, to remain in Gibraltar and collect their pension by registering with the ETB as seeking employment, which was the only way they could be given the opportunity of remaining here which we were not aware of until he announced it. We did not know if this was being done or if this was a new development. Once he announced it we have been trying to establish exactly when it came in and how many people are affected and so forth.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him the exact month and year, so his question should have been, 'can the Government now state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with annual monthly residence permits?', because that question

asked now would at least update the question to reflect the answer that he was given back in April. He continues to mis-ask the question ignoring the information that he was given in answer to the question in April. If he particularly wants to know the date on which a policy other than the one that he describes when his question was asked, I am happy to provide the information to him but I do not have that information with me, I will let him know.

-----

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just go back to Question No. 1052 which is on the non-EU pensioners, because I have just checked the Hansard to which the Chief Minister was referring? In fact what he told me the last time when I asked this question was that the reply he was giving me was the same thing as he had said six months ago, which he did not recall. Then I reminded him that in answer to Question No. 2472 of 2004, which we can fish out and look at if he has any doubts about it, he had told me that the sort of person that I described was issued with monthly residence permits as opposed to annual. He told me in answer to Question No. 2472 of 2004 that they were not annual that they were monthly. Then I asked him in that supplementary to Question No. 2472 of 2004, well would the answer have been yes instead of no if I had used in the question monthly instead of annual, and he said yes. He confirmed that I had got it wrong by putting yearly permits, so I put monthly permits. Now that I have put monthly permits he tells me that I have got it wrong in putting monthly and that I should put yearly, and that if I had done it properly and put yearly he would have given me the answer. I do not know whether the answer I am now going to get again is the one I got in reply to Question No. 2472 of 2004 telling me to put monthly. I can assure him that it all started with me asking about annual permits. In Question No. 2472 of 2004 I said, 'can Government state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with annual residence permits?', which is what he has just told me I have to give him notice of. I gave him notice of that in 2004 and he told me that I had got it wrongly worded and that it should have been monthly, which is what I am asking now and I am now being told that it should be yearly. So I will go back to repeating Question No. 2472 of 2004 which will probably come about in December 2005 and coincide with the anniversary of the original.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In April of this year he asked me 'can Government state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with monthly residence permits, how many such persons currently have such permits and under which provision of the Immigration Control Ordinance have such permits been issued?'. Answer the Hon the Chief Minister: 'there were a total of 32 male non-EU pensioners over the age of 65 and 46 female non-EU pensioners over the age of 60 who were in possession of annual residence permits.' There is no need to go back to 2004 or before, this is in April of this year, Question No. 565 of 2005. There is no policy, I hope that appears in his version of the Hansard.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Why does he not carry on? He says there is no policy and that non-EU pensioners are provided with monthly permits of residence. Then I asked him.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That was the answer he got.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, and what about all the rest?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It goes on, 'therefore there are no such persons who currently hold monthly permits.' That was the answer to the question as he asked it, the rest is all supplementaries.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Of course. So what, because it is supplementaries they do not count?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It was not the nature of his question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Chief Minister saying then that what he answered in the question in the previous meeting of the House, that the answer he gave me then was incorrect? He said no, because he never likes to say that he is wrong in anything. So I said, 'well does he recall that the last time he said there were no permits and he said that if I had put 'monthly' instead of 'annually' in my original question the answer would have been yes there was a policy. I go back now to the one where he told me that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It has always been monthly.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister says it has always been monthly, is it monthly or yearly?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Last year, in April and now I have just told him. It is not monthly. The hon Member is now trying to justify the fact that he asks in relation to 'monthly' because I had indicated to him in 2004 that if he asked in relation to 'monthly' the answer would be different. But it is not monthly and that has been evident from the last two answers that I have given him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, perhaps I can get him a copy of page 663 in which he said, he came back after exchanges and said, 'can I correct the hon Member in what he said that this was not the case. Persons of the sort that he has described are issued with monthly residence permits as opposed to annual'. This is Question No. 2472 of 2004. The question was, 'when was the policy introduced that non-EU pensioners should continue to be provided with annual residence permits?'.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, now that reference, either referred to persons which he referred in the question or persons which he referred in the meantime in some supplementary. In other words, one has got to see whether that answer relates to the persons to which he described in the question or to some other group of people that emerged in our discussion on supplementaries.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can tell him what is the sentence immediately preceding. I was under the impression that at some point it had been decided to allow persons to register as unemployed and therefore get a permit of residence beyond their retirement age, but clearly this is not the case, that is what I said. He then came back and said, 'can I correct the hon Member when he says this is not the case. Persons of the sort that he has just described, that is, persons allowed to register as unemployed and go beyond the retirement age are issued with monthly residence permits as opposed to annual which is what his question sought'. Then I asked him, 'well then if I put 'monthly' instead of 'annual' will I get the answer?' and he said yes. So I have been putting monthly instead of annual ever since.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The original question was 'monthly' and he was told that they were annual. In answer to the original question he was told that they were not monthly, they were annually. I have just read it to him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the Chief Minister reads how it started, he does not read how he finished. He finished by saying, 'there is an administrative concession whereby if unemployed Moroccans looking for work are actually too old to work, then just for this purpose his monthly residence permit gets renewed every month'. That is him saying it not me.

Since I always believe all the things he tells me I have been putting 'monthly' ever since.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have to check the question myself. The problem with all these supplementaries is that the nature of the discussion moves on from the original question and then I cannot be sure, I have not got Hansard in front of me, whether the two things that he is comparing are comparables. The original answer that he got to the original question, Question No. 565 of 2005, made it clear that they were not issued with monthly permits. He has asked now in Question No. 1052 the same question, a question again saying it was 'monthly' and I have confirmed the position. Now he says 'yes but the position that you last confirmed by the time we had finished with supplementary questions in April, left you with the impression that the original answer in April had been wrong and really it was monthly after all'. So when he has come now in October or in September to ask the question again, he reverted to monthly. Well, that is the interpretation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can tell him why, because when we finished and it is on page 817 of the Hansard of April, he said to me 'yes I understand all that, I asked him to give me the name of the question so that I can refer to it'. The same thing that he is saying now. I told him exactly the same thing that I am saying now in April and he finished in April saying to me, 'well yes, that is what you say but give me the number of the question', which I said was Question No. 2472 of 2004, 'and I will refer to it'. Well I left it at that point with him that he was going to go back and check the Hansard to see if what I was telling him was accurate and I was not leading him up the garden path. I have now put the question having assumed that notwithstanding his very busy schedule, between April and now he has been able to look at Question No. 2472 of 2004. This time I am helping him a bit more by making photocopies of everything and passing it on to him when we finish today's meeting.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He may be interested in getting the chronology and the history of this right. The point is that they are not issued with monthly permits. Now that is the position.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore the Chief Minister is confirming that the answer that he gave me in December last year to Question No. 2472, which is recorded in Hansard on page 664 as his final statement on the subject, was in fact incorrect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would have to check the context of that answer. I am not willing to do it on the basis of his analysis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, on the basis of the accuracy of the record which says that if unemployed Moroccans looking for work are actually too old to work, and everybody understands that it is just for the purpose of getting his monthly residence permit, I do think they get them every month. So they are monthly permits not annual.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not suggesting that he is inventing those words. I said I have to see them in the context in which they were uttered to see what is their proper interpretation and effect, and to see whether it is contradictory of the fact that they are not monthly.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We are now being told it is annual, which was in fact my original question a year ago. When was the policy introduced to give annual permits? The Chief Minister has said that was a new question of which I need to give him notice and I will, but it happens to be a new question which is now a year old.

**NO. 1053 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD - CONTRACTORISATION**

Have the Government had any response from Her Majesty's Government on the report they submitted on the economic impact of the MOD's contractorisation plans?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There has been no technical response or reaction to the Report. However, in a letter addressed to me on 18<sup>th</sup> July by John Reid, the Secretary of State for Defence, he said that the Report had been reviewed and that the estimates of the short term impact presented in the report looked sound, but that his Economic Analysts do not share Professor Fletcher's negative view of the ability of the Gibraltar economy to adjust.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1053 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So what they are saying in the reply is that Her Majesty's Government, or the experts that they employ, consider that the impact .....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is as assessed but .....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But we are capable of surviving that and much more. Our experience shows that we can survive much more than is thrown at us but it is not very helpful.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, particularly not when the purpose of sending this report is recalled, which is that when Geoff Hoon said that he would take it into account in his decision. If that was going to be the answer then there would not have been any point in preparing the report. No one has suggested to him that if they proceed with this contractorisation

that the world is going to stop spinning as far as Gibraltar is concerned and that we are going to grind to a halt. What we have said to them is that there are significant economic impacts of doing it in the way that they want to do it, namely of achieving the savings in the way that they want to save them, which would be averted to a great extent if those savings were achieved in a different way. That was the purpose of the report not to demonstrate that if they contractorise a couple of hundred jobs, or three or four hundred jobs, that that would be the end of the economy of Gibraltar. So it is a complete non sequitur the answer really in the context of the purpose of the report.

**NO. 1054 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INTERNATIONAL DIALLING CODE**

Can Government explain what is the nature of the technical problems and economic cost associated with the possible use of the 0044 international dialling code for Gibraltar from Spain?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The main technical issues with economic cost implications are:-

- Would traffic continue to be channelled directly between Spain and Gibraltar over the cross border infrastructure despite the use of “44”?
- If so, would telephone companies charge calls at international tariffs applicable between the United Kingdom and Spain or at Spanish “inter-urban” tariffs as is the case at present.
- The system would also require modification, that is to say, the use of “44” for calls from Spain, would also require modification to Spanish international exchanges which has a cost implication.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1054 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The changes the Chief Minister refers to is to the Spanish exchanges presumably, would be a cost implication for them, does it require any changes that either we would have to introduce or UK would have to introduce to their systems?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The UK might well have to introduce changes to its systems so that its systems understood that when calls entering the UK system for “44”, because even if the traffic was sent down the frontier infrastructure the question then arises would it also go the other route. If it went the other route the UK might well have to educate its switches for them to recognise that this is actually not traffic for the UK but traffic for Gibraltar, even though it is prefixed and arrives with the “44” pretext. There is

nothing for Gibraltar to do here in respect of this, at least in respect of the third point. The first two raise issues of user tariffs.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the use of that would be the cost to the user in Spain calling Gibraltar, it might make Gibraltar a more expensive place to call from Spain but it would not be an extra cost for somebody here calling in the opposite direction, that would not change.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, that is precisely one of the issues, if we do go "44" would the cross-frontier infrastructure continue to work as it does today, so today from Gibraltar one can call Spain in two different ways. One can call 0034, indeed one has got to do that when calling a mobile from either landline or mobile, so there is already a certain number of Gibraltar telephone subscribers used to paying the international tariffs. The other way that one can presently call Spain is by dialling the Spanish area code directly. If that were to continue, if that ability to interconnect our networks by ringing the Spanish area code from Gibraltar were to continue, then what the hon Member says is right, those people would charge no more. If Spain were to say, 'well fine if we are going to do it "44" then let us do it "44" for everything' and then this ability of connecting directly from Gibraltar to Spain through dialling a Spanish code, then the issue would arise of whether all traffic from Gibraltar to Spain would be charged on the "34" basis. In other words, if they say 'well fine if it is going to be "44" from Spain let everything be via the international', those are the issues but the cost implications in Gibraltar are mainly of the user type and not of capital investment in terms of the telephone operators here. I should add that in our view the use of "44" is preferable whatever might be the tariff implications if the alternative is an arrangement which either has political strings attached or which leaves Gibraltar's numbering plan in the next wave of problems, if they were to say 'well have another 100,000 numbers' well some future Government is just going to have the same problem.

ORAL

**NO. 1055 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAPE TOWN CONVENTION**

Can Government say whether the Cape Town Convention and its Aircraft Equipment Protocol was extended to Gibraltar after the UK signed it on 16 November 2001 and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1056 of 2005.



**NO. 1056 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAPE TOWN CONVENTION**

Can Government say whether the EU has been able to ratify the Cape Town Convention and its Aircraft Equipment Protocol en bloc after it became known publicly that Spain raised the Gibraltar issue in July of this year in the course of the negotiations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The UK has not yet ratified the Convention or its Protocol. Under the terms of the Convention it may extend them to its Overseas Territories and Dependencies by unilateral declaration at the time of ratification or subsequently.

The EU has not yet been able to pass a Council Decision authorising individual Member States to proceed with ratification because of the disagreement between the UK and Spain over the way that it would apply to Gibraltar if extended to us.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1055 AND 1056 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister tell the House what the nature of the disagreement actually is, because that was really never very clear?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The nature of the disagreement is that Spain would like the post-box arrangements to apply to it, and the post-box arrangements are limited to EU measures or to international agreements which build on EU measures, and not generally to international treaties and Conventions. The post-box arrangements, agreed to in an EU context, are for a nature of international agreement which is very carefully defined and the UK and Gibraltar are resisting any attempt by Spain to make it the norm for all international Conventions, that is the nature of the dispute.

**NO. 1057 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**1960 PARIS CONVENTION**

Can Government say whether the 1960 Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy has been extended to Gibraltar and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am informed that the Convention has been extended to Gibraltar. The Director General of the ENEA notified other parties of this in December 1970.

The Convention was then amended by a Protocol of 16<sup>th</sup> November 1982. This was ratified by the UK and, I am informed, extended to Gibraltar on 19<sup>th</sup> August 1985.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1057 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Have the Government been informed why Madrid felt it necessary to enter a reservation whereby they assume jurisdiction over the entire Bay, and not recognise our own jurisdiction over the Bay, when they had not done this originally when they themselves signed the Convention in 1961?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is no knowledge of Spanish reservation referred to in the article in El Faro which appeared in 2005 and must have stimulated the hon Member's interest in this matter.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

That may have been El Faro but what I saw was actually a circular by Europa Press which referred to a meeting of the Spanish Council of Ministers and which in the course of that meeting one of the issues which they raised was attaching a formal declaration on the part of Spain specifically to do with Gibraltar, which says that they do not recognise any rights or situation in terms of the Bay which are not contained in Article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht of 13<sup>th</sup> June 1713 agreed between the Crowns of the United Kingdom and Spain. It seemed odd to us that although they entered this

reservation now, they had not entered it originally when they signed the Convention in 1961, and we want to know whether Government have any information to indicate why they have entered this reservation now and they did not enter it then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government certainly do not have any such information. Indeed, we are being told that there is no knowledge of any such reservation having been entered, which would appear to call into question the accuracy of the press report. Obviously Europa Press, I think it is more or less the same, I think it is the form in which it emerged in El Faro but obviously drawing from the same news agency report, I am being told that there is no knowledge of the Spanish reservation to which those reports refer. Certainly, they are not at liberty to enter reservations sort of 43 years after the event.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I agree with the Chief Minister. What this refers to is a declaration, it is a unilateral declaration on the part of Spain in relation to this particular topic and in relation to the jurisdiction over the waters in the Bay. This information is from the United Kingdom, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe so. My note does not say that it is from the United Kingdom but all these international Convention questions are usually referred back to the Foreign Office for information. I assume that that is the case here too. I do not know what a unilateral declaration is, one can make a minute statement in the context of the EU, one can enter a reservation or make a declaration at the time that one signs or ratifies an international Treaty, it may be that this is just a political declaration of the sort that he and I might make tomorrow morning if it takes our fancy, it does not necessarily have any validity in terms of the international law aspects of this Convention.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

This was in May and at the time it was approved by the Council of Ministers for forwarding to the Spanish Cortes Generales in Madrid, so it could well be that this is still in the process of being made or being entered.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1058 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COURT PLEADINGS**

Has a hearing date now been fixed for the substantive hearing of the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission following the close of pleadings in this action?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1059 and 1060 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1059 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COURT PLEADINGS**

What stage has now been reached in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission following the close of pleadings?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1058 and 1060 of 2005.

**NO. 1060 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COURT PLEADINGS**

Will the Government now agree, pursuant to the Chief Minister's previous answers in this House, to provide the Opposition with copies of the formal pleadings in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission, either openly or in confidence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The exchange of written submissions is now closed and the parties are now waiting for the court to set a date for the oral hearing. The last pleading that closed the pleading stage was the Gibraltar Government's response to the Spanish Government's intervention, which I think went in last week. Now that the pleadings stage has closed, the Government will again give further and final consideration to whether we are willing to provide the Opposition with copies of those pleadings in confidence. The question entertains the possibility of being either openly or in confidence, in either case, in no circumstances could it be openly. So even if we did agree to issue it, which has not yet been agreed, it would have to be in confidence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1058 TO 1060 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I assume it would be openly after the trial starts, when the pleadings will be open to one and all who have the money to turn up in Brussels at the hearing. Can I ask the Chief Minister when he expects to reach that consideration because it is now some time since he promised to start the process of consideration. I have had course to write to him in relation to this matter twice, dealing also with a related matter, and I would just be grateful so that we know when we are dealing with this issue in the House, what exactly it is that we are dealing with and we do not stray into an area where we might actually be not doing ourselves, any of us, any favours. So that is the first part of my supplementary, when does the Chief Minister think that we could have a determination from him on this issue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him, it does raise serious issues in the Government's mind about the precedent value of the Government having to share with the Opposition what is on-

going Governmental business of pleadings in litigation generally. Certainly, we need to consider whether we want to place this and future Governments of Gibraltar in a position whereby documents that are internal to Government, in the sense of for example but not limited to this, there are aspects of Governmental business that Government are entitled not to produce documents to the Opposition about. Another thing is to give political accountability in the House in answer to questions, but the concept of providing documentation to the Opposition in respect of on-going, live Governmental business is quite unusual, and there are issues about read-across to other cases, to other litigation, indeed to other nature of documents other than documents in litigation which need to be considered. If the hon Member were to say that if the Government were to agree to it in this case it could be treated as ring-fenced creating no precedent whatsoever and not to be referred to as a precedent, or alleged constituted precedent, that might eliminate a major issue in the Government's mind.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am quite happy to take the documentation on the grounds that the provision of it would be extraordinary, ring-fenced and otherwise caveated as the Chief Minister has indicated in his answer, and as he might otherwise wish to caveat although of course I would have to see those caveats before necessarily agreeing to them. That is what he told me last time but we do not seem to have advanced the position at all. That may be, I do not want to at this stage put blame on the Chief Minister's back for the delay, because there appears to be a Spanish intervention which, as I understood his answers previously and the Government's public statements on this matter, was not expected, is that right? Can the Chief Minister confirm that the Spanish intervention in this matter was unexpected?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not think the Government would say that it was not expected. Certainly it adds very little to the Commission's case, in fact it is almost ungermane to the case in many of its aspects, one could imagine things that it might say. Certainly I do not think I have ever given any indication that it was unexpected.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There was another problem of regionality.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see, no, they are perfectly capable of that sort of mental summersaults. In fact in the Azores Case they argued very strongly against the application of the principle of regionality to fiscal measures, and indeed in this case they say that they do not agree with the Commission's reasonings on regional selectivity as well. They still think that we should not be allowed to get away with it but they do not agree with the Commission's views on regional selectivity. I think the nature of the intervention was unexpected, frankly, but I do not think the fact of the intervention was unexpected. For example, it is unexpected that they oppose the Commission on regional selectivity.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Obviously, if I could just leave it with the Chief Minister to expedite consideration of these issues so I could have the pleadings, if he agrees to give them to us, before I read the judgement, of course that would be great.



**NO. 1061 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MUTUAL ASSISTANCE**

What action do Government have to take in order to comply with the ruling of the European Court of Justice in relation to mutual assistance between Member States in relation to the payment of VAT and other indirect taxes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are advised that no legislative action is required to give effect to the ruling. There is however, a consequential amendment required to our legislation transposing EC Directive 76/308 on recovery of tax claims and certain levies and this is being prepared. The reason why no legislative action is required to give effect to the main aspect of the ruling is that VAT and excise taxes, to which the ruling related, have subsequently in the commencement of the action been taken out of the scope of the legal assistance to which the action related, and therefore within regulations which are of direct application to Gibraltar. So there may be a need for an administrative compliance but no legislative action is needed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1061 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does this mean that Gibraltar now has to give information or exchange information in relation to goods which pay VAT in the EU, but obviously not here, which are then exported to Gibraltar VAT-free, whereas before they would not have to give any information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, this does not relate to information relating to Gibraltar's own collection or non-application of excise or to goods, this relates to mutual assistance in relation to other countries' own taxation of dutiable or excisable goods under their system. In other words, if I am correctly understanding the hon Member's supplementary, it would not require us to give them the information about the volume of tobacco exports from Gibraltar into Spain because that is relevant to their VAT or excise tax regime. That is not how it works. If he reads section 4 of the Income Tax Ordinance, which is how the Mutual Assistance Directive has presently been enforced for direct taxation, that is the regime that would be created in respect of VAT and indirect taxes. I think it is

section 4 but if it is not section 4 it is in the first ten sections of the Income Tax Ordinance.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1062 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU DIRECTIVES**

How many EU directives were pending transposition into Gibraltar law according to Gibraltar Government records as at 30 June 2005, and how many of these required transposition before that date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1063 and 1064 of 2005.

**NO. 1063 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU DIRECTIVES**

Can Government say how many infraction proceedings are open by the European Commission against the United Kingdom for the non-transposition of directives in Gibraltar showing the name of the directive, the date on which infraction proceedings commenced, and the stage in the procedure in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1062 and 1064 of 2005.

**NO. 1064 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU DIRECTIVES**

Can Government say how many cases of non-transposition of EU directives in Gibraltar are currently before the European Court, showing the name of the directive, the date on which the court action commenced, and the stage in the court procedure in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The figures which I will shortly be giving to the hon Member refer to directives which the Government of Gibraltar through their own resources have traced and have included in their records as being applicable. There may be other directives applicable to Gibraltar of which we have not been notified and have not identified for ourselves.

Secondly, the hon Gentleman will know that directives have a final transposition date usually attached. Nothing is required of us prior to that date, so in other words it is only overdue if the final transposition date has passed, and the fact that it has not yet been transposed does not mean it is overdue or due. As I understand the hon Gentleman's question he wishes to know details of all directives due for transposition whether their final transposition date has passed or not. So in relation to Question No. 1062 when he says 'pending transposition' he wants to know all the directives that have not yet been transposed, whether or not the due final date has yet arrived and then how many are late in the sense that the final transposition date has passed.

As of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2005 there were 140 directives due for transposition, that we are aware of, and 102 of these required transposition before that date. In other words, had a final transposition date before 30<sup>th</sup> June.

The reference in the question to infractions being 'open' is open to misinterpretation in this context. This is because infractions may be, for a variety of reasons, inactive, although remaining technically open. This may happen, for example, when the infraction chefs have decided not to proceed with an infraction or when the Member State being infringed has carried out whatever action was being required of it by the European Commission. In these circumstances nothing more would be done by the Commission to prosecute the infraction, although for a variety of reasons, the Commission would not formally close the infractions dossier until some time later. In the interregnum it would still be technically open but not actually live.

In Gibraltar's context I can report that over the last four years 45 infractions have been issued, although only 24 are active in the sense that I have just described.

At present, there are two Gibraltar cases before the European Court of Justice, two Gibraltar-related cases, for non-transposition of directives. They are as follows:

1. Recognition of Professional Qualifications

The written procedure has been completed and there will be no oral hearing. We await the Advocate-General's opinion and judgement.

2. Interests and Royalties

The matter has been referred to the ECJ but action has not yet commenced. The hon Member will recall that the Interests and Royalties Directive is one where the rest of Europe appears not to be recognising Gibraltar companies on a reciprocal basis, and therefore we said to the UK that if they are not getting the benefits why should we take on board the obligations, and that matter is presently where that matter lies and the matter is the subject of infraction.

I give the hon Member the list of outstanding directives, in other words it is the 140 of which 102 are overdue, so this is not the infraction list, this is the list of directives that we have been able to identify through our records, are pending transposition 140 of them of which 102 the final transposition date has passed and therefore they are now overdue, as opposed to the 38 which are pending transposition but are not yet overdue. If the hon Member asks me supplementaries, which I do not think he will, about the items on this list I will no longer have the list in front of me because I have only been given one copy. I will give him time to consider it himself. It is just a list of directives in a wide range of areas. There is a separate list of the ones the subject matter of infractions.

**Contd Answer to Question 1064**

In Gibraltar's context I can report that over the last four years 45 infractions have been issued, although only 24 are active.

At present, there are 2 Gibraltar cases before the ECJ for non-transposition of directives. They are as follows:

1. Recognition of Professional Qualifications

The written procedure has been completed and there will be no oral hearing. We await the Advocate-General's opinion and judgment.

2. Interests & Royalties

The matter has been referred to the ECJ, but action has not yet commenced.

The information requested by the Honourable member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1064**

**ANSWER TO QUESTIONS 1063 AND 1064**

**Gibraltar related infractions (as at 7<sup>th</sup> October 2005)**

Infraction reference	Measure	Date of Infraction/ commencement of action	Stage
C-505/04	Directive 2001/19 amending Directives 89/48 and 92/51 on the general system for the recognition of professional qualifications and Directives 77/452, 77/453, 77/686, 78/687, 78/1026, 78/1027, 80/154, 80/155, 85/384, 85/432, 85/433 and 93/16 concerning the professions of nurse responsible for general care, dental practitioner, veterinary surgeon, midwife, architect, pharmacist and doctor	23 <sup>rd</sup> December 2004	Before the European Court of Justice Written procedure completed and there will be no oral hearing. We await the Advocate-General's opinion and judgment.
2004/0268	Directive 2003/49 (interests & royalties directive) on a common system of taxation applicable to interest and royalty payments made between associated companies of different Member States	Referred to ECJ on 5 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Before the European Court of Justice Referred to the ECJ. Action has not yet commenced.
2002/2258	Directive 89/665 the remedies directive	25 <sup>th</sup> July 2003	Reasoned Opinion issued
2004/1500	Directive 2001/45 amending Directive 89/655 on the minimum health & safety requirement for the use of work equipment by workers at work	15 <sup>th</sup> December 2004	Reasoned Opinion issued
2004/1505	Directive 2002/96 on waste electrical and electronic equipment	15 <sup>th</sup> December 2004	Reasoned Opinion issued
2004/1513	Directive 2003/108 amending 2002/96 on waste electrical and electronic equipment	15 <sup>th</sup> December 2004	Reasoned Opinion issued
2005/0438	Directive 2003/51 (the modernisation directive) amending Directives 78/660, 83/349, 86/635 and 91/674 on the annual and consolidated accounts of certain types of companies, banks and other financial institutions and insurance undertakings	13 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Reasoned Opinion issued
2004/1503	Directive 2002/83 on life assurance	13 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Reasoned Opinion issued
2004/1502	Directive 2002/49 on the assessment and management of environmental noise	15 <sup>th</sup> December 2004	Reasoned Opinion issued
2004/2022	Regulation 2037/2000 on substances that deplete the ozone layer	13 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Reasoned Opinion issued
2005/0249	Directive 2003/08 on the improvement of access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes	4 <sup>th</sup> February 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0250	Directive 2003/24 amending Directive 98/18 on safety rules and standards for passenger ships	4 <sup>th</sup> February 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0251	Directive 2003/25 on specific stability requirements of ro-ro passenger ships	4 <sup>th</sup> February 2005	Article 226 Letter issued



*Contd Answer to Question 1064*

*Contd Answer to Questions 1063 and 1064*

2005/0437	Directive 2003/09 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers	22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/2204	Telecoms regulatory framework concerning: Directive 2002/21 – The Framework Directive Directive 2002/19 – The Access Directive Directive 2002/20 – The Authorisation Directive Directive 2002/22 – The Universal Service Directive Directive 2002/58 – The E-Privacy Directive	13 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0717	Directive 2002/77 on competition in the markets for electronic communications network and services	28 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0718	Directive 2003/103 amending Directive 2001/25 concerning the minimum level of training for seafarers	28 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0879	Directive 2002/44 (the vibrations directive) on the minimum health & safety requirements regarding the exposure of workers to the risks arising from physical agents	3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0880	Directive 2002/98 setting standards of quality and safety for the collection, testing, processing, storage and distribution of human blood and blood components (and amending Directive 2001/83)	3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0881	Directive 2003/33 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to the advertising and sponsorship of tobacco products	3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0885	Directive 2004/33 implementing Directive 2002/98 as regards certain technical requirements for blood and blood components	3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2004/1520	Directive 2004/69 on the definition of multilateral development banks	15 <sup>th</sup> December 2004	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0440	Directive 2003/123 amending Directive 90/435 on the common system of taxation applicable in the case of parent companies and subsidiaries of different Member States	22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2005	Article 226 Letter issued
2005/0721	Directive 2004/106 amending Directive 77/799 concerning mutual assistance by the competent authorities of the Member States in the field of direct taxation, certain excise duty and on the holding, movement and monitoring of such products	28 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Article 226 Letter issued

**NO. 1065 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government state what are the prospects in the short, middle and long term of Slovenia Telekom or another undertaking acquiring the equity holding that the Government, Verizon or both hold in Gibtelecom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The House has been informed previously that Verizon plans to sell its shareholding in Gibtelecom. The Government understand that Verizon have now sold almost all of their investments in Europe and are now looking to complete their exit from Europe by selling their equity in Gibtelecom. There is therefore a very high prospect that Verizon will sell its stake to one of the parties with which it is presently in discussion, which includes Slovenia Telekom, and indeed that may be short-term, the question was short, middle or long term, I think Verizon are looking to exit as quickly as possible. With regard to the Government's shareholding in Gibtelecom, while the Government are not actively seeking to dispose of their shareholding, they would certainly listen to and consider any options that emerged as part of Verizon's disposal. In other words, for example, if the buyer of the Verizon stake said, 'how about it, you sell me yours and here is my offer', we would look at it and form a view at the time but there is not a 'for sale' sign over our stake.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1065 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Government consider buying out Verizon, they have no interest in doing that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, none whatsoever.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Suppose the price at which Verizon could sell to a third party appeared to be very attractive, would they not be interested then in buying them out?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that the Government have got better things to do with their capital in terms of social projects and housing projects than invest it in a telephone company. Governments right across Europe are divesting themselves of telephone companies not acquiring them, and I think not just for that reason but in our case also because competition is now beginning to take hold, we are now beginning to see other telephone companies beginning to break into the market, which has been the whole purpose of the getting on with the Telecoms Liberalisation Directives and actually, although there are Chinese walls between the Regulatory Authority, the Minister is the Licensing Authority, I am not sure that the companies other than Gibtelecom actually quite believe that Government are actually remote from regulatory and licensing issues on the one hand and their shareholding in Gibtelecom on the other. So for that reason alone I think that it will be a good thing. They are not going to give their stake away, if they were planning to sell it for a ridiculous amount of money the Government might then consider it, but frankly I think the tendency of previous Governments to put distance between this sort of activity and the Government was well based and ought not to be reversed.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1066 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government provide an update on the status of the tender for the Sewage Treatment Plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

As previously communicated in answer to Question No. 643 of 2005 in the last meeting of the House, the appointed consultant was undertaking a preliminary study and assessment of the project with this having now been completed. Submission of the consultant's report is expected soon after the New Year.

ORAL

**NO. 1067 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's Public Highways that were resurfaced during the period October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question No. 1068 of 2005.

**NO. 1068 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS**

Can Government state the major works in respect of Gibraltar's Public Highways that they propose to put out to tender up to the end of March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Over the past months a number of projects relating to the Public Highway have been put out to public tender. These include the Engineer Lane and Bell Lane beautification contract, the first phase of the new link road through Orange Bastion to Fish Market Road and the first phase of the works to replace the balustrade and footpath along Europa Road.

In addition, the Highways Term maintenance Contract was awarded in October 2005 and the contractor has already mobilised. They are proceeding in line with the programme of works set out for them and areas such as Cathedral Square and the roundabouts at Winston Churchill Avenue and Line Wall Road are under way.

With regard to future projects, public tenders for the beautification works to the southern end of Main Street from Southport Gates to Convent Place will shortly be invited. These works will, apart from enhancing the street scape in the area, also include the provision of new infrastructure, with the new sewer and storm water drainage runs being an important element of this. These will replace the old systems which have experienced collapses in the recent past.

It is also intended to proceed with the public tender for the second phase of the Orange Bastion/Fish Market Road project which extends up to the Waterport area.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1069 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CALPE TENANTS ASSOCIATION**

Given previous answers in this House, when will the envisaged action to tackle the problem of unsightly and unhygienic rubbish dumps in the area of Calpe commence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Answered together with Question No. 1070 of 2005.

**NO. 1070 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CALPE TENANTS ASSOCIATION**

Why were the tenders received for Ape Proof Litter Bins at an estimated cost of £30,000 (Head 105, Subhead 5, Upper Rock Improvements and Maintenance) considered not to represent value for money so that the tender as originally conceived was not therefore awarded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

As previously stated in answer to Question No. 648 of 2005 of the last House, funding for the construction of two new refuse enclosures at Calpe Married Quarters and Willis' House has this year been made available to the Department of the Environment, as has funding for the temporary up-grading of the existing bin cubicle at Willis's Road. Revised designs were prepared and negotiations have now been concluded with the contractor. Works on the construction of the first of these cubicles will commence after the New Year, with this being scheduled for completion prior to the end of the Financial Year.

During the financial year 2003/2004 a tender was invited for the provision of Ape Proof Litter Bins for the Upper Rock Nature Reserve. Although a number of bona fide tenders were received, it was considered that the tendered unit costs were excessively high and did not represent good value for money. This tender was not therefore awarded.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1069 AND 1070 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister has not given us a start date but he has given us a finish date so that perhaps may be even more useful, can he tell us in relation to Question No. 1070 of 2005 exactly what the tender unit cost was in respect of each unit?

**HON J J NETTO:**

In relation to his first question, completion date as I said is before the end of the financial year but I do not know exactly when but it is scheduled to be before the end



of the financial year. In relation to his second question, I have not got that kind of information available with me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We would have thought it was information that was necessary for the Minister to answer the question as it was phrased, can I ask him to let me have that information?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The first thing that the hon Member should bear in mind is that this goes back to 2003/2004 at a time when neither myself nor my current personnel were at the helm, so to speak, dealing with these particular projects. The information which we have tried to produce in order to give him the information has been from the Procurement Office. So long as they have got the information I do not see any reason why I should not be able to pass it to the hon Member.

**NO. 1071 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Can Government state what action if any they are pursuing in respect of the concerns of many residents of the South District at the high levels of Benzene detected on occasions by the Government's own air quality monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Many residents of the South District have not, as far as Government are aware, expressed concerns at the alleged high levels of benzene. The limit value for benzene for the protection of human health is set out in our Public Health (Air Quality Limit Values) Rules and in Council Directive 2000/69/EC. This corresponds to an annual average of  $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  with a margin of tolerance at present of an additional  $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  reducing on 1 January 2006 and every 12 months thereafter by  $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . This means that for 2005 the annual average limit value is  $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  reducing by  $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  annually to reach  $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  by 1 January 2010.

Because this present limit of  $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  is set as an annual average, it must be accepted that there will be many individual hourly readings which will be above this level.

If we therefore consider an hourly reading about  $20 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  as a possible cause for concern for residents of the South District, we find there have been 27 hourly readings above this level out of 7713 hourly readings taken since monitoring for benzene commenced on 4 February 2005 and up to 10.00 am on 5 December. This represents 0.35 per cent of all readings.

The vast majority of these 27 hourly readings are directly related and attributable to road traffic and are centred around some 15 days usually around 9.00 am which represents peak traffic conditions. These levels are expected at a road side monitoring station in a position such as ours.

There are also a handful of hourly peak benzene levels usually registered at around 5.00 am to 6.00 am which are not identifiable as related to traffic or other specific sources and which we continue to investigate. However, because of their very sporadic occurrence (3 March, 24 August, 1 December) and short duration it is very difficult to try and determine their source. We continue however to work on this.

Having said that, we are extremely confident that come the end of the recording year, when we will be able to calculate our annual average and compare it to the EU limit levels, we will be well within not only the present limit values but also the more

stringent one of 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> set for 2010. As a matter of fact our average so far this year is only 2.28 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. We, of course, accept this does not represent the full year's reading but we do not expect much deviation from this.

I am also pleased to be able to inform the House that we are expanding our monitoring capability and that right now we are installing equipment which will enable us to monitor four additional ambient air pollutants. These are – arsenic, cadmium, nickel and poly-aromatic hydrocarbons. Monitoring for these pollutants will start within the next few days.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1071 OF 2005**

##### **HON F R PICARDO:**

Let me thank the Minister for that very full answer but in his earlier answer in answer to Question No. 657 of 2005, he told us that a lot of the spikes were really likely to be suspect spikes. In fact I will be able to quote his reference if he does not recall what he said. Does he now believe, therefore, that the spikes that I referred him to at the last meeting of the House were not suspect spikes at all?

##### **HON J J NETTO:**

I do not recall saying all of those particular readings were suspect, I did say to one in particular was suspect and that was information given to me by people in the Environmental Agency. Now the hon Member has to realise that this particular monitoring stations, the equipment there are extremely sensitive, so much so that when one happens to have a car with the engine on next to the air monitoring station, at that particular moment there will be a very high reading of benzene. That is something that if it happens, so to speak, at 7.00 am by the time that an officer of the Environmental Agency goes to work and pops in to the monitoring station at 9.00 am, he will find that there is no trace whatsoever of benzene of that occurred at 7.00 am. It is something which they have looked at very seriously themselves and they have been able to relate it to movements of traffic because along with the levels of benzene they are also looking as to the level of carbon monoxide, two ingredients which happen to be very much linked to traffic movement. So the one thing that is pointing one can safely say is that those levels of benzene are very much related to those particular traffic movements, particularly very early in the morning because it is next to the road which is very busy as far as people going to work.

**NO. 1072 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT - RECYCLING**

Why has the project to introduce recycling previously awarded to tender by Steelmac Limited not proceeded with that party and when do the Government expect that the project will get under way?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Steelmac Limited was not awarded a tender for recycling as no such tender has been advertised. This company made an approach to Government to set themselves up to provide such a service to the community and this received the Government's support. The parties entered into an agreement for the provision of this service but shortly thereafter a number of operational difficulties arose that delayed the commencement of the project. Those difficulties were eventually overcome but the company has recently informed the Government of its inability to comply with the terms and conditions of the contract. Government are therefore presently considering the situation and assessing their options. Government nevertheless remain fully committed to recycling.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1072 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us where he believes that the Government's assessment of their options will lead them?

**HON J J NETTO:**

There can be a couple of options, this particular company may wish to change its position and adopt the original position and come back to us, that is one particular option. If they choose not to do so Government need to see that the bins that were purchased were purchased by Government and European money, Government need to find out whether legally we are entitled to obtain those particular bins back into Government for the purpose of actually putting a tender out, perhaps somebody else may wish to approach the Government on similar terms that Steelmac did originally, or indeed other options. This is a particular facility that may also be able to be incorporated in a much wider context like an environment park, so indeed there are

various options and possibilities but obviously we are not there. We are where we are at the moment and we need to see what is going to happen with this particular company in relation to the agreement and the contract that we signed.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Anybody who hears the Minister's argument repeatedly will not doubt that he is committed to recycling, seeing as he recycles his arguments in every House, but let me just try and concentrate on this particular issue. Is it that the Government are saying that they are still in negotiations with Steelmac or not?

**HON J J NETTO:**

We are not in negotiation as such, I do recall that Steelmac made an approach and had a meeting with one of my Civil Servants but there is no negotiation as such. We are not re-negotiating the clauses that were signed in that particular contract, it is a matter for Steelmac to honour it or not to honour it but we are not in negotiations with Steelmac.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

One of the other things that the Minister said was that perhaps another party might approach Government to suggest that they might be able to comply with those conditions, are the Government open to proposals from the public or from companies?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Well, in the past we have been open but it might be that we have to go to tender again, not again because this particular company, Steelmac, did not go to tender but we might go to tender. It is an option, it is not one decided but it is an option.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

If that is one of the options when do Government expect to be in a position to tell us whether they have decided to go to tender or if they have decided to take another course?

**HON J J NETTO:**

We will be in a position once we have made our minds up, obviously we have not made our minds up yet so I am not in a position to tell him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Let me not labour the point, when do the Government expect to make up their minds? That is what we are trying to get at.

**HON J J NETTO:**

When we are ready.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think that shows the type of commitment that there is to recycling. Does the Minister not realise that if they say that they are committed to recycling they must surely be able to tell us when it is that they expect to deal with this point, or does he not?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I simply do not agree with the hon Member's proposition.

**NO. 1073 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**OESCO**

Will Government state what is the estimated cost of the noise insulation works which have been announced in respect of the OESCO power station at Europa Business Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Government are not presently in a position to state what the cost of the insulation works at the OESCO power station is likely to be as details have yet to be finalised and this work is likely to be the subject of a future tender.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1073 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister then tell us exactly what he meant in his political broadcast when he told the whole of Gibraltar that works would start soon?

**HON J J NETTO:**

What it means is that there is a commitment by the Government to do the insulation of the OESCO power station soon, that is what it means.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

But what exactly does soon mean in the Minister's vocabulary? Does it mean in this financial year, does it mean in the next financial year?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Soon means what the dictionary says so I suggest he goes and checks the dictionary.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister not agree with me that soon certainly does not mean after we have done everything that we should have done before we announce the process?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, we do not agree.



ORAL

**NO. 1074 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

When was the post of Human Resources Officer for the Buildings and Works Department vacancy opened, how many individuals applied for that post, how many were interviewed, what has been the result of that interview procedure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1075 of 2005.

**NO. 1075 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Of all the applicants who have applied for posts in the Buildings and Works Department and who are under the age of 30, how many were not interviewed for the post because the RGP informed that they have minor offences (such as speeding, making a nuisance by playing loud music, failure to vaccinate a dog, et cetera)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1074**

The post of Human Resources Officer, Buildings and Works, was advertised on 21 April 2005. A total of 23 applications were received. All the applicants were interviewed. The decision to select and appoint a candidate remains under consideration.

**Answer to Question No. 1075**

The minor offences mentioned by the hon Member would not result in candidates not being interviewed for posts in Buildings and Works.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1074 AND 1075 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister give us a date by which they believe they will appoint the Human Resources Officer?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1076 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are currently on the pre-list for housing giving a breakdown of the flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1077 to 1082 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1077 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the Housing Waiting List currently, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1076 and 1078 to 1082 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1078 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of each category of room composition, can Government state, as on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005 before the new pointage system was applied, how many applicants there were in each waiting list category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1076, 1077 and 1079 to 1082 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1079 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state, in respect of each month as from the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005, how many applicants were rejected on the grounds that they were homeowners who had chosen to sell their homes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1076 to 1078 and 1080 to 1082 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1080 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state, in respect of each month as from the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005, how many applicants were accepted because in the judgement of the Housing Allocation Committee the sale was really genuinely necessary?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1076 to 1079, 1081 and 1082 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1081 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of applicants already on the list can Government state, for each category of waiting list and for each month as from 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005, how many applicants had overcrowding points disallowed because other people who had sold their homes had moved in with them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1076 to 1080 and 1082 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1082 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of applicants already on the list can Government state, for each category of waiting list and for each month as from 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005, how many applicants had overcrowding points allowed when other people who had sold their homes had moved in with them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the statistical information requested.

**Answer to Question 1082**

**Answer to Question 1076**

There are 487 applicants on the pre-list as follows:

1RKB	-	313
2RKB	-	36
3RKB	-	85
4RKB	-	49
5RKB	-	3
6RKB	-	1

**Answer to Question 1077**

There are 748 applicants on the waiting list as follows:

1RKB	-	403
2RKB	-	52
3RKB	-	196
4RKB	-	84
5RKB	-	11
6RKB	-	2

**Answer to Question 1078**

There were a total of 670 applicants on the waiting list as follows:

1RKB	-	386
2RKB	-	47
3RKB	-	161
4RKB	-	65
5RKB	-	8
6RKB	-	3

**Answer to Questions 1079 to 1080**

No applications have been received from persons who have sold their houses after the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005.

**Answer to Questions 1081 to 1082**

No applicant already on the list has had overcrowding points allowed or disallowed for the reason stated in the question.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1076 TO 1082 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could I ask the Minister to explain how they intend to allocate a home to the one person, I have to assume it is the same person, who has been on the 6RKB for some time, that is on the pre-list, when the time comes for that person to move to the official list and there are two people on the actual housing list proper that request a 6RKB. When do they hope to have a house ready of a 6RKB composition? Are they being refurbished, because I do not think there are any in the so-called affordable homes schemes? I am just comparing the statistical information given concerning people who are on the pre-list and people who are on the housing waiting list proper. What I am asking the Minister is are there any empty 6RKB homes that are being prepared to accommodate these people?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not know if there are at this moment in time any 6RKB houses being refurbished, I do not have the list in front of me. Obviously they will be accommodated as soon as those rare flats, because there are not many I suppose, become available.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to Question Nos. 1079 and 1081 which shows that that new prohibition which was, I think, an essential part of the new scheme on people selling and applying, there is no evidence since the scheme as announced of anybody trying to get on the waiting list in that category from the answer that we have had. Was there evidence that it was happening just before when the Minister brought the new rules in?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

There must have been evidence when the new rule was brought in.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well look, people are known to make mistakes in life so therefore the fact that something was done on the premise that there was a need for it, we are trying to find out if there is evidence now that these rules have been brought in that people as a result are being rejected who might otherwise have been getting in. Do the Government have any notion of that?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

There is no rejection and over the last two and a half or three months there just happen to have been none who have applied. That is all it means.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know that there have been no rejections so nobody has been rejected on the grounds that they have sold their house. That presumably means that nobody who had sold their house applied, but since the purpose of the scheme being changed was to stop this category where the Government said these people were getting an unfair advantage because they were selling out only to get back on the waiting list, do Government have any idea whether the fact that there were no applications for example since 5<sup>th</sup> August how that compares with what was happening before?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

People have just stopped applying if they were applying before, which they were.

**NO. 1083 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ALLOCATION PROCEDURES**

Can Government confirm that the movement of persons from the pre-list for housing to the main list will not be affected by the award of points introduced on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005 under the Housing Allocation Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The question is not very clear, if what the Hon Charles Bruzon is asking refers to whether anything in the 5<sup>th</sup> August Regulations in any way stops or interferes seriously with the passage from one list to the other the answer is no.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1084 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state, of the applicants who had joined the pre-list after the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2003, how many were persons who had previously chosen to sell their homes and applied for Government housing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1085 of 2005.

**NO. 1085 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

In the 12 months ending on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005, how many applicants moved from the pre-list to the main list and of these how many were identified as being homeowners who had previously sold their homes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1084**

A total of 560 applicants joined the pre-list after 5<sup>th</sup> August 2003.

**Answer to Question No. 1085**

A total of 261 applicants moved from the pre-list to the main waiting list.

I wish to add that Government are willing to provide the Opposition with further detailed information of the sort requested specifically in the identification of home owners. However, given the intense administrative burden of extracting this information within five days, it can, if the hon Member wishes, be provided in due course.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1084 AND 1085 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Yes, I would like the Minister to provide the information requested at his earliest convenience, maybe within ten days if possible.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister not agree that in fact, presumably the need to which he referred in answer to a previous Supplementary of mine to do something about home owners getting on the waiting list ought to be reflected in the answer to these two questions? Would he not agree that that would be the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is what I have just said, it would be information available but we would have to extract that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But presumably at some stage the Department must have done something to come to that conclusion. It would be very peculiar if when it was extracted we found out that there was practically no such category, given that he has just told us that there was a reason otherwise it would not have been done.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Certainly the decision to alter the rules in that way amongst several other ways did not respond to some sort of a scientific assessment of the applicants, it was not an empirical study, it was done on the basis of complaints from people who said 'well look, why is this person on the waiting list?' and people waiting on the housing list had a tendency, I got some of this in my clinics where I see people, people pointing accusatorily at the Government saying 'ah, but see I do not move up the list but then people who have sold houses do'. So very often policy is made on the basis of weight of observations made by others which if they can be addressed should be addressed. The hon Member may be trying to establish whether or not the policy change was necessary, he may be trying to establish what empirical evidence there is that this problem existed. I suppose though that he is not arguing that if it does exist it should not have been put right. In other words, that people should buy often subsidised housing from a home ownership scheme, sell out, make and pocket a huge profit and then get into the housing waiting list competing with others for a further house. Now, I understand the hon Members' wish to see whether it was a malady that existed in the first place and therefore whether the change of rules was in fact necessary, but I do not think, I understand he may or may not wish to since we are here to answer and not ask questions, I have not detected that he is suggesting that it was an erroneous change if the problem did exist.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is just that the Government press releases at the time made it very clear that it existed, we are not suggesting that people should be encouraged to sell their homes and go on the waiting list. What we are saying is that given the fact that this policy was introduced as something to stop what was going on, and the Government press release actually states that very clearly, and the unfairness of this and people taking unfair advantage, one would have thought that that would have followed an investigation to establish not just that somebody thought it was a case and complained but that it was actually happening. The question was designed to do that frankly in the expectation that the exercise had already taken place.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1086 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of the Housing Waiting List for the 1RKB, can Government say how many applicants from the 11<sup>th</sup> position down were adversely affected after the new pointage system came into effect on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1087 to 1089 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1087 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of the Housing Waiting List for the 2RKB, can Government say how many applicants from the 11<sup>th</sup> position down were adversely affected after the new pointage system came into effect on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1086, 1088 and 1089 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1088 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of the Housing Waiting List for the 3RKB, can Government say how many applicants from the 11<sup>th</sup> position down were adversely affected after the new pointage system came into effect on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1086, 1087 and 1089 of 2005.

**NO. 1089 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

In respect of the Housing Waiting List for the 4RKB, can Government say how many applicants from the 11<sup>th</sup> position down were adversely affected after the new pointage system came into effect on the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1089**

**Answer to Questions 1086 to 1089**

TYPE	MOVING DOWN LIST
1RKB	231
2RKB	16
3RKB	98
4RKB	29

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1086 TO 1089 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Of the 231 that were adversely affected for the 1RKBs did the Minister's office receive complaints about these?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No complaints were received by me personally, I do not know if any other member of the staff at the Ministry for Housing received complaints.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that what we are being told is that as a result of the extra points being given for waiting time some people moved up the list and some people moved down and that meant that 231 moved down out of 313 on the 1RKB, was there not justification for giving greater weight to waiting time the effect that it was having on the list of people selling and joining the list?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Not exclusively that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister explain what is the rationale of the new policy, if it is not people taking unfair advantage which is all his press release talked about? For example, in cases where people get allocated higher points for dampness, for overcrowding, for not having a bathroom, for not having running water why is it that the Government think that even if nobody is taking unfair advantage, those people should still not carry as much weight as people who have been waiting a very long time in better housing conditions?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, because it is difficult to explain and people are reluctant to accept and understand that people who have been on the housing waiting list much less time than them, nevertheless overtake them and what was happening was that there were many people on the housing waiting list that used to go down the list and further down the list every year. They were on the housing waiting list for five years and instead of going up towards the top, as one would expect, they were in fact getting further and further down because there were people coming in either for the reason of the things we were discussing before, the abuse factors, or perhaps because the way the normal system used to operate whereby there were too many people getting too many additional points for factors which he and I may not think constitute abuse. In other words, it was not part of the selling home ownership and then coming in, that is what we call the abuse factor, but there were other factors which do not fall into that abuse category which entitled people who had joined the list much later to

additional points and people who think that waiting time is the principal factor on a waiting list, were nevertheless constantly being overtaken. Of course the reason why so many more people move down than up is because if one person moves up by five places that is tantamount to four or five people moving down. All the people that he has overtaken are included in the number of people who have moved down the list because they have all moved down by one, so it only takes one person to jump six places for there then to be five people, all of whom have moved down, and are on the list of people moving down.

So, there was a housing pointage system that had been in place for many years and which people in the Housing Department thought needed reform, not just to eliminate the abuse from selling of co-ownership homes and others but also to be fairer, without suggesting that before the people who had been advantaged with points were not also been fairly treated, but to treat more fairly people who had been waiting on the list. In other words, to give a higher premium value to pure waiting time on the list. That is what has happened. Whether the mathematical formula arrived at does that in precisely the right measure is another matter, but of course that cannot be scientifically calculated. There is an assent of transitional period in that where all the sudden movements take place as people get credited with historical points and then in future the additional points are obvious. So that is the reason and we think it is working fairly, but of course it is working fairly for some people at the expense of other people not making as much progress up the list as they would have made had we not changed the rules. There are winners and losers there is no doubt about it.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1090 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – DWELLINGS BEYOND ECONOMIC REPAIR**

Can Government state how many Government dwellings are considered to be beyond economical repair?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1091 of 2005.

**NO. 1091 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – DWELLINGS BEING REFURBISHED**

How many empty Government dwellings are presently refurbished or in the hands of Buildings and Works for refurbishment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1090**

It will not be possible to come up with a figure which realistically reflects the current situation until the asset register is completed.

**Answer to Question No. 1091**

As of 1<sup>st</sup> December 2005, there were 39 flats being refurbished by Buildings and Works actively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1090 AND 1091 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

About a year and a half ago I asked the Hon Mr Netto, the former Minister for Housing, about the asset register and I think the answer was that this was an on-going thing. Surely Government must be in some kind of position to give us a rough idea as to how many empty Government dwellings need refurbishment. Does that make any sense to the Minister? Do Government not have at least some idea as to how many empty Government dwellings need repair work done or refurbishment?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is precisely the purpose of the asset register. If one goes down the route of being precise mathematically we have to be precise and it will take time for that precision to come through via the asset register. I could give wild guesses which is sometimes what the Opposition do, we want to be precise and that takes some time.



**HON C A BRUZON:**

I understand that but being precise is important but how many years is it going to take to be precise because I asked that question a year and a half to two years ago and I was told that this was an on-going thing. So therefore it will never be precise.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I beg to differ, it will be precise, the time will come when there will be a figure. It could be another year and a half or two years.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister honestly expect us to believe that this Government for the past 10 years have not been able to work out how many empty Government dwellings there are which require refurbishment?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

What I cannot believe is that in the eight years prior to this Government's 10 years nothing was done absolutely.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. The point of order is this and I have made it before. The Minister at Question Time is here to answer questions about the Government's running of the Government's affairs not to raise issues about the eight years that might have preceded their stint in government from 1988 to 1996. The Government have a majority in this House, if they want to bring a motion to criticise the previous administration they are free to do so, Question Time is about answering questions.

**MR SPEAKER:**

The question invited a comment of sorts rather than sought to elicit information it actually invited a statement. The question was 'does the hon Minister believe' it is not a question designed to elicit a specific answer so it did rather open up the ambit of the answer but I do rule that answers should be limited to answering the specific question rather than going into broad statements of present policy or broad criticisms of previous policy.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I take the point but the point is in respect of the question of the asset register and the mammoth task of compiling a register of all the houses that exist in Gibraltar that may be repairable and so on is something that is historical. Really we have started to do something which could have been started much earlier and had it been started much earlier would now represent a much shorter time to be able to arrive at a conclusion today. The point I am making is that if the GSLP Government had done this we would have been in an easier position to do it now.

**MR SPEAKER:**

The question as I understood it for the Minister to answer was 10 years and I think that was the answer, it was not the last 18 years.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1092 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how many Government tenants are currently listed as requiring work to be done in their homes by the Housing Department as landlords?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1093 to 1095 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1093 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WATER HEATERS**

Can Government confirm that it is their policy to repair or replace defective water heaters of pensioner tenants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1092, 1094 and 1095 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1094 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how long have the oldest orders of work in the Buildings and Works Department been outstanding?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1092, 1093 and 1095 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1095 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how many outstanding Orders of Work are there presently in the Buildings and Works Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1092**

The total number of Government tenants requiring work to be done in their homes is 2,050.

**Answer to Question No. 1093**

Requests from pensioner tenants for repairs to or replacement of defective water heaters are considered on a discretionary case by case basis.

**Answer to Question No. 1094**

The oldest works order refers to a very minor case of dampness and is dated 29<sup>th</sup> April 1999.

**Answer to Question No. 1095**

There are presently 3,348 outstanding works orders in Buildings and Works.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1092 TO 1095 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Did the Minister say that with reference to Question No. 1093 regarding defective water heaters that they looked at each specific case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

What are the general results of looking at each specific case? Is the general tendency to replace the heaters or repair them or not to?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I did say that each case is considered on a discretionary basis.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

When the Buildings and Works inspectors visit these pensioner flats what criteria do they use to determine whether or not a particular water heater should be fixed or replaced?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think it is quite logical, I do not have the criteria list in front of me but I suspect that it would be things like how well off or not that person is, how well off or not the water heater is and so on.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is it not Government policy not to repair water heaters of elderly people unless the Social Services Department makes a recommendation?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No that is not the case. The Social Services Department I believe have a particular vote which they also use at their discretion as cases come in whether or not to replace or repair.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister satisfied that six years is an acceptable time for a tenant to wait for repairs to be done at their home?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, of course I do not accept that and a similar answer is elicited now to the one I gave earlier on. The works orders are constantly coming in, this is a continuum going back many, many years and that is why there is always a tailback as it were. There is also prioritisation of works required, urgent, less urgent and so on, this was

a very minor piece of work that unfortunately, and I agree it should not take that long, thus staying behind but this is always the case over the years including previous Governments, they have also faced that problem and we have inherited huge amounts which will always create a tailback.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would make the point of order I made earlier but I think that any ruling made is going to fall on deaf ears.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1096 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many applicants on the Housing Waiting List to date are medically recommended, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1097 of 2005.

**NO. 1097 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many persons to date are medically recommended, excluding those that are described as applicants on the Housing Waiting List, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1097**

**Answer to Question 1096**

There are 46 applicants on the waiting list and pre-list who are medically recommended as follows:

A*	-	0
A	-	14 (under offer)
B	-	14
C	-	18

**Answer to Question 1097**

There are 217 persons medically recommended, excluding those that are described as applicants, on the waiting list and pre-list as follows:

A*	-	7
A	-	68 (under offer)
B	-	63
C	-	79

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1096 AND 1097 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I notice that in answer to Question No. 1097 of 2005 where there are 217 persons medically recommended there are still seven marked 'A' with an asterisk, are those the same that were there two months ago when the Minister told me they would be reallocated a home immediately?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The ones with an asterisk, the asterisk designates immediate allocation. Immediate allocation is what the Housing Allocation Committee concludes after looking at the cases. Immediate allocation comes about the moment there is a suitable flat. Medical cases require very specific flats, some even in particular areas of Gibraltar so it is not easy to come by these flats. I do not know whether they are the same cases.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1098 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated to date since the answer given to Question 664 of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1099 of 2005.

**NO. 1099 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF REPOSSESSED FLATS**

Can Government state how many Government flats have been repossessed to date since the answer given to Question No. 667 of 2005, giving a breakdown of pre-war and post-war?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1098**

A total of three pre-war flats have been allocated since the answer given to Question No. 664 of 2005.

**Answer to Question No. 1099**

One post-war flat has been repossessed since the answer given to Question No. 667 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1100 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households have applied for rent relief in October and November 2005, and how many of these were approved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1101 to 1104 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1101 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households have received rent relief in October and November of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1100 and 1102 to 1104 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1102 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households were on full rent relief in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1100, 1101, 1103 and 1104 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1103 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households have had the level of rent relief reduced in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1100 to 1102 and 1104 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1104 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state how many households on rent relief have had this benefit terminated in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1104**

**Answer to Question 1100**

The number of households that have applied for rent relief in October and November 2005, and the number that were approved is as follows:

October	-	8	(4 approved)
November	-	5	(2 approved)

**Answer to Question 1101**

The number of households that have received rent relief in October and November 2005 is as follows:

October	-	720
November	-	700

**Answer to Question 1102**

The total number of households on full rent relief in October and November 2005 is as follows:

October	-	78
November	-	74

**Answer to Question 1103**

The number of households that have had the level of rent relief reduced in October and November 2005 is as follows:

October	-	52
November	-	47

**Answer to Question 1104**

The number of households on rent relief that have had this benefit terminated in October and November 2005 is as follows:

October	-	16
November	-	12

ORAL

**NO. 1105 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government state how many tenants have entered into agreements to pay arrears of rent in October and November 2005 and what is the total of arrears covered by such agreements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The information requested is as follows:

**Answer to Question 1105**

	<b>Number of Tenants</b>	<b>Total of Arrears (£)</b>
<b>October 2005</b>	16	37,955.35
<b>November 2005</b>	19	38,713.54
<b>TOTAL</b>	35	76,668.89

ORAL

**NO. 1106 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – REFERENDUM HOUSE**

Can Government say whether the faulty lift at Referendum House has now been repaired and if so, on what date was it working again?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1107 to 1109 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1107 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – REFERENDUM HOUSE**

Can Government say on what date was a request made for the spare part needed to repair the lift at Referendum House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1106, 1108 and 1109 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1108 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – REFERENDUM HOUSE**

Can Government give the cost of the spare part that was needed for the repair of the lift at Referendum House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1106, 1107 and 1109 of 2005.

**NO. 1109 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – REFERENDUM HOUSE**

Can Government say on what date was the faulty lift at Referendum House first reported by tenants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1106**

I can confirm that the lift at Referendum House was successfully repaired and put into operation on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

**Answer to Question No. 1107**

From information supplied by the Electricity Authority minor spares were ordered in May 2005. In addition, major components had to be ordered later on in August 2005.

**Answer to Question No. 1108**

The total cost of the main components amounts to 14,800 euros.

**Answer to Question No. 1109**

The lift at Referendum House has experienced numerous regular faults which have been the result of wanton acts of vandalism. However, during a routine maintenance exercise the Electricity Authority established problems with the gearbox and motor and subsequently decided on safety grounds to shut down the lift on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1106 TO 1109 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I am not sure if the Minister has answered a specific part of the question but could he tell me why it took from August 2005 to the end of November 2005 for the lift to be in



a working condition, if the spare parts both minor and major were received in May and August?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well, the parts themselves did take a long time to arrive.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Subsequent to arrival.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well, I do not know I do not have the answer. This is a technical problem and they have been working at it. They repair and then they are vandalised almost regularly, this is the problem.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1110 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

What progress has been made in moving the Buildings and Works Department to an Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

There has been no further progress in moving the Buildings and Works Department into an Authority.

ORAL

**NO. 1111 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government confirm that staff of the Buildings and Works Department have to rely on their own transport to attend job functions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Buildings and Works employees do not have to rely on their own transport to attend job functions.

**NO. 1112 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DRUG ADDICTION**

Can Government state what procedure is followed to help young people with a drug addiction who because of their age cannot be admitted into Bruce's Farm?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Not all young people with problematic drug use require residential rehabilitation.

The Government have introduced the following measures to help young people with differing degrees of problematic drug use.

1. Guidance and advice surgeries are being established at both secondary schools. These surgeries will be run by counsellors every other week during the lunch hour.
2. A mentoring scheme has been implemented for those under 17 to receive support in the Community from senior peers who have completed the 12-step programme at Bruce's Farm.
3. Social Services also deals with cases which are received through the usual referral groups. Each young person's needs are assessed individually and the appropriate help offered, for example, counselling or referral to the mentoring scheme.
4. The age of admission into Bruce's Farm has been lowered to 17 in consultation with the staff and trustees. In isolated cases of severe problematic drug use of persons under 17, where it has been established that residential rehabilitation is the only option, Government have funded this treatment at a specialised centre outside Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1112 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I thank the hon Lady for that information. Could she clarify just one doubt that I have? Did she say that these youngsters with a drug addiction are given counselling during their lunch hour and in school?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes, this is a service that we are about to set up or will be set up very shortly in both secondary schools where there will be counsellors available for whatever juvenile there is with a drug problem, in different degrees I have said, to approach them and receive advice or counselling or whatever is considered appropriate.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is it wise to have counselling done in the school? Are these youngsters easily identifiable by other students and will they know that these people have a problem?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

That is the reason why this actual service has not started yet, because of the logistics of trying to identify a suitable place where precisely that problem will not arise. It is difficult so I do not really know whether it will actually come to fruition because as the hon Member says, they are going to have to find a place where youngsters are not easily identifiable when they go in and things of that nature.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister think that it is wise to have in a lunch break counsellors in schools to counsel juveniles with drug addiction, during school time at lunch break? Does the Minister agree with that?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I do, this is something that has been advised by different people or experts in the field in consultation with the teachers and it is just a catchment area of trying to offer counselling for juveniles with some sort of drug problem from within the school. This is only one of the measures that we are adopting.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us which is the centre that is used when people are referred outside, is there one centre or are there a number of centres that we use?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I can say that we have only had to use one particular centre twice over the past years, at least over the years that we have been in office, and it has been a specialised centre. It is a specialised centre in Seville actually.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can we be given an idea of what it is that that centre does which we cannot do, what area of expertise is it that they have?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Because it is a centre that specialises in young people as opposed to adults.

ORAL

**NO. 1113 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for October and November 2005 giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1114 and 1115 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1114 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many persons receiving social assistance in October and November 2005 have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1113 and 1115 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1115 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for October and November 2005, giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1115/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1113 of 2005**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER  
2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

<b>2005</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>26/35</b>	<b>36/45</b>	<b>46/60</b>
<b>OCTOBER</b>	186	296	482	71	159	120	132
<b>NOVEMBER</b>	183	291	474	69	153	121	131

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1115/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1114 of 2005**

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
4th	Oct-05	186	296	482	71	159	120	132
	Nov-05	183	291	474	69	153	121	131

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
4th	Oct-05	12	1	13	4	3	3	3
	Nov-05	1	1	2	1	1	0	0

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 2ND DECEMBER 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
02-Dec-05	185	284	469	67	152	122	128

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1115/2005****Answer to Question No. 1115 of 2005****PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER & NOVEMBER 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE.**

<b>Months</b>	<b>0-10</b>	<b>11-20</b>	<b>21-30</b>	<b>31-40</b>	<b>41-50</b>	<b>51-60</b>	<b>61-70</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Oct-05</b>	26	28	23	12	18	9	0	116	83	33
<b>Nov-05</b>	26	26	25	12	18	9	0	116	83	33

**ORAL**

**NO. 1116 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – RESPITE CARE**

Can Government confirm that 800 hours a month was provided in the current financial year for respite care?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1117 and 1118 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1117 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – RESPITE CARE**

Can Government state what was the estimated cost of providing 800 hours of respite care a month in the current financial year and under what heading in the account of the Social Services Agency is this amount included?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1116 and 1118 of 2005.

**NO. 1118 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – RESPITE CARE**

Can Government say how much of the amount provided for Respite Care in the Estimates has been spent up to the 30<sup>th</sup> September of the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1116**

The provision of respite hours has varied over the months during the current financial year. The average has been 999 hours per month. However, as a result of an emergency, one of the respite users had to be taken into permanent care in June. Most of the respite hours have therefore been used since then to care for him permanently whilst the Agency recruits more staff. As a result the hours of respite care for other service users have had to be reduced and practically came to a standstill in August. Despite three different recruitment attempts these have proved unsuccessful so far as the vast majority of the applicants have not met the required standard.

**Answer to Question No. 1117**

The estimated cost of providing 800 hours of respite a month in the current financial year is £33,000. This is included in the relief cover vote under Other Personnel.

**Answer to Question No. 1118**

The amount provided for respite care is not set in stone. The Agency tries to maintain a ceiling of 800 hours per month for regular respite care. Over and above this however, extra respite is provided during the holiday periods and in emergencies, for example, in cases of illness of the main family carer. Normally the cost of providing this level of respite is in the region of £80,000 per annum. Approximately £41,000 have been spent this financial year up to 30<sup>th</sup> September, although as I have already explained in answer to Question No. 1116, most of these hours have been absorbed in caring for an emergency placement.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1116 TO 1118 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Concerning the recruitment of staff, I have occasionally noticed in the media advertisements for supply staff but there seems to be a problem with regard to qualified permanent staff, is that the case?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The fact that they are permanent on supply has nothing to do with the other. The advert that comes up has the same requirements for both permanent and supply. There are certain skills, not so much qualifications, obviously if they have an NVQ2 in care they are given greater priority as is obvious but it is more a question of skills and experience rather than qualifications. But whatever is required is required the same for a permanent or a supply worker.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Thank you. The problem that I have in understanding the procedure is that unless there are permanent workers then the concept of supply does not seem to make any sense because one brings in supplies to supply for permanent employees who for one reason or another are not available for work.



**NO. 1119 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ST BERNADETTE'S CENTRE**

Can Government state what educational programmes are currently being conducted in St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

As the name suggests, St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre undertakes a host of activities which are mainly occupational in nature. Educational programmes are not the focus of provision.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1119 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister happy that there are no educational programmes in an establishment where, although it is occupational therapy, they are there basically nearly all day and therefore some education programmes would be advisable? Does the Minister not agree with that?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes, I do agree but not necessarily delivered by a teacher within the Centre.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have not asked that a teacher do or conduct these programmes. There are educational programmes that can be conducted by other people other than teachers. The question is can the Minister state, or is the Minister unhappy that there are no educational programmes in a Centre as St Bernadette's?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

As far as I am concerned educational programmes are delivered by teachers within the teaching profession.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, the Minister should know that educational programmes can be handled by other people in the medical profession inclusive, or people who are on the Out Reach programmes which are done in schools. Like speech therapists, like occupational therapists, they can also be running educational programmes so the Minister is actually wrong in saying that it has to be handled by teachers. Despite that, does the Minister not think that it is about time that St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre had some sort of educational programmes?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes I agree and Government are currently looking at several proposals on how the post of teacher, because they do have a teacher in the establishment, can be put to better use. It does not necessarily mean that the teacher has to deliver these educational programmes from within St Bernadette's because as he sees it at the moment he actually feels that his post is a wasted resource within St Bernadette's. The post of teacher, apparently according to him, is a wasted resource because not everybody within the Centre has the capacity to receive educational programmes so what we are looking at is proposals from the teacher himself to see how his post can be put to better use.

**NO. 1120 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the community service sentence for convicted juveniles and adults is still in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1120 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state when was the last time a community service sentence was conducted and dug out?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The community service has been continually operational since its inception in October 2001. I cannot say when the last community sentence order was issued.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do the Youth and Community Leaders have anything to do with the community service?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member must know community service order sentences are issued by courts of law and there is a Community Services Officer who administers the supervision, the placement and the supervision of the sentence, so in that context perhaps he might like to clarify his supplementary.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have not understood a word that the Chief Minister is saying but despite that, the problem is the way that he has actually said it. I will ask the question again just in case he misunderstood the first time. Can the Minister state whether the Youth and Community Officers deal with community service sentencing? That was the question.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Now it is me who does not understand what he is talking about. What does he mean by deal with community sentences? Community sentences are orders which are issued by the court when somebody has committed an imprisonable offence and it is a form of reparative work within the community. It entails the offender, the court and the Community Service Officer.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Exactly, the Community Service Officer and I am asking Youth and Community Leaders are they part of the Community Officers?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

There is only one Community Service Officer.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Right, that is the issue, thank you.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1121 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – INSOLVENCY FUND**

What is the exact amount erroneously credited to the Insolvency Fund up to 31 March 2005 in respect of social insurance contributions, estimated to be in excess of £1 million and referred to in paragraph 3.3.9 of the Principal Auditor's Report 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

The amount erroneously credited to the Insolvency Fund up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 was £1,161,773. An adjustment will be made by the Treasury Department in this financial year.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1122 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state how many individuals were employed by the Social Services Agency to prepare child welfare reports in the financial year 2005-6?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1123 to 1127 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1123 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – WELFARE REPORTS**

What is the period that the courts have had to wait for the preparation of welfare reports delivered in October and November from the date that the preparation of such reports had been ordered by a court and what was the number of such reports, giving a breakdown between Magistrates and Supreme Court matters?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1122 and 1124 to 1127 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1124 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – WELFARE REPORTS**

Can Government state how many probation, pre-sentence and child welfare reports have been prepared in the year to date by Social Services for hearings involving access to children in both the Magistrates and Supreme Courts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1122, 1123 and 1125 to 1127 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1125 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – WELFARE REPORTS**

Can Government state who in the judiciary informed the Minister for Social Affairs that there was a delay of 6 months in the preparation of reports into the welfare of children ordered by the Magistrate's or Supreme Court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1122 to 1124, 1126 and 1127 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1126 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – WELFARE REPORTS**

Can Government state how the Minister for Social Services determined who “family practitioners” are in relation to her answers for supplementary questions to Questions Nos. 595 to 597 of 2005 and, in particular, how it was represented to Government that such “family practitioners” did not consider considerable a delay of 6 months in the preparation of reports into the welfare of children ordered by the Magistrate’s or Supreme Court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1122 to 1125 and 1127 of 2005.

**NO. 1127 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL WORKERS**

Have Government now recruited two more Social Workers for the announced Court Social Work Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1122**

One social worker has been involved in preparing Child Welfare Reports in the financial year 2005/2006.

**Answer to Question No. 1123**

Two reports were submitted in October and November to the Magistrates' Court. One was requested in October 2004 for submission in October 2005, therefore submitted on time. The other was requested in August 2005.

Three Child Welfare Reports were submitted in October and November to the Supreme Court. These reports were requested in February, May and July 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1124**

The number of pre-sentence reports prepared this year to date by Social Services involving access to children in both the Magistrates' and Supreme Courts is 60.

The number of Child Welfare Reports is 22.

I am informed that there is no such thing as a Probation Report.

**Answer to Question No. 1125**

I have never said that any one in the Judiciary has informed me that there was a delay of six months in the preparation of reports into the welfare of children ordered by the Magistrates' or Supreme Courts.

**Answer to Question No. 1126**

As I already explained to the hon Member in answer to Question No. 597, court welfare reports begun to be delayed by three to six months during the financial year 2003/2004. On making my own enquiries at the time I was informed by management that during a meeting of family practitioners at which representatives of Social Services were present, the general sentiment being expressed was that a delay of six months was not a considerable delay. The comment to this effect that I made in answer to the previous supplementary that the hon Member is referring to was based on my recollection of this conversation.

**Answer to Question No. 1127**

Vacancies for two more Social Workers will be advertised next week.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1122 TO 1127 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So does the Minister accept that her recollection was not correct when she told us that the people involved, the Judiciary in fact, those were her words, found acceptable a delay of six to twelve months, or is it that her recollection was correct and she stands by that sentiment?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

As far as I am concerned my recollection is correct.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So in that case who in the Judiciary has suggested that a delay of six months is not a considerable delay?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we are at cross purposes. I think the essence of her answer is that she has never said that anyone in the Judiciary et cetera, et cetera, the six months. The recollection bit is about who said that six months did not amount to a considerable delay and she has given the explanation that that is based on her recollection of the meeting at which family practitioners were there, and there are two aspects to that. One is the bit about who in the Judiciary said it and the other is about her recollection about who said that it did not amount to considerable. The issue whether six months is or is not a considerable delay is a separate question. I think her recollection relates to the latter point.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Hansard of the last meeting will show that the Minister said this, 'a delay of six months is not even considered a considerable delay by the Family Practitioners and the people involved', the Judiciary in fact. Did she have a conversation with anyone in the Judiciary or was she simply told that at the meeting she has told the House that she attended.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I have never said I attended any meeting, I have just explained to the hon Member that this comment was passed on to me at the time that I was making my own investigations into the delay, by the Management of the Social Services who had attended a meeting with the Family Practitioners at that time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it that the Minister is saying that she was told that at that meeting somebody had said that the Judiciary considered a delay of six months acceptable, is that what she is telling us?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I said that the general sentiment appeared to be, as related to me, that that was the case.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister not agree with me that there is a chasm between general sentiment and the Judiciary having communicated something to Social Services?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I have never said that it came out of the mouth of the Judiciary. What I said, and he has just repeated himself, is that a delay of six months is not even considered a considerable delay by the Family Practitioners and the people involved, in fact the Judiciary.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

But if she is not putting that sentiment into the mouths of the Judiciary can she tell us how it is that either to her or to Management, so that it is represented to her, that sentiment is attributed to the Judiciary?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I think I have already given an explanation and I do not intend to repeat it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not think the Minister has given an explanation, this is a very serious matter. We are dealing with delays of six to twelve months in the preparation of Child Welfare Reports and I think that there is general agreement around the House that that is unacceptable. I do not think we are having an argument about that, but the Minister told us last time that somehow, and I am prepared to accept that she now says that it was not told to her by a member of the Judiciary, somehow the Judiciary have communicated to somebody involved, so that Management have come to her, that a delay of six months is not considered a considerable delay. Can she tell us how that was represented to her as coming from the Judiciary?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister is here to give an explanation of Government policy to give information and certainly if the hon Member thinks that she has misled the House to bring a motion to debate the question if he wants to, but much as I find amusing and interesting his criminal trial lawyer cross-examination style at Question Time, he cannot continuously get up to ask the same question time and time again when the answer has been given. He can say that he is not satisfied with the answer and he can demonstrate political dissatisfaction with the answer but he cannot carry on repeating the question simply because he does not find the answer convincing. That is a cross-examination which is not what we are engaged in in these proceedings in this House.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is not an answer at all to the question that I have asked and I am as amused by the Chief Minister's attempt to defend his Ministers as if he were defence counsel in criminal proceedings. I have no difficulty with him intending to do that but let him not paint himself as an *amicus curiae* or an *amicus* to the chair in trying to calm waters because an answer is not being given. The question is very simple, how does the Minister come to this House to represent that the Judiciary, it is very clear in her own words, considered that six months of wait for such a report was not a considerable delay? I have not suggested that she has misled the House because I would have made no bones of making that representation if I believe that that is what she has done. All I am asking her is how she was led to believe that the Judiciary accepted this, that is all. If she tells me, 'I was told by Management', so be it. That was the first step that she took. My further question is simply this, how did Management come to tell her that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister has answered both those questions, that is the position of her and the Government and he is not getting another answer even if it is repeated a fourth time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister tell the House whether she still is of the view that that is the position of the Judiciary? That the Judiciary does not think six months is too long, does she still hold that view?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I think I will repeat again that the comment that I made was in reference to my own enquiries at the time that the delay began to come about when it was six months. As the hon Members will have seen from my answers it is much more than six months at the moment and as I already have explained in the past we are about to remedy the situation. So I would not be in a position to say what the Judiciary thinks about the delay at this moment in time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I have asked is not what the Judiciary think about the present delay because that does not arise from the original question. I am asking her whether she still continued to hold the view that she expressed in the last meeting of the House namely, that the view of the Judiciary was and is that six months delay is not too long, is that still the position that she holds or not?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, having not spoken to the Judiciary directly myself I can only relay the message that was passed on to me at the time and which I have repeated today on umpteen occasions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the information that she provided us was on the basis of hearsay and not because she actually knows that this is the case then?

**NO. 1128 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of Social Insurance schedules as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005 in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01, giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Question No. 1049 of 2005 posed an identical question to which the answer was provided in schedule form. I am quite happy to pass it on again if he wants it.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1128 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the number of schedules that was provided in answer to Question No. 1049 have gone up since then with the information she has got or would it still be the same?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would not know, if it is the same question that was answered the answer that was drafted for me here is that he has already got that information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The schedules cover a quarterly period and the most recent quarter is 30<sup>th</sup> September, would more schedules relating to that quarter have come in since then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we would need notice of that question. The answer that he has been given is that inadvertently obviously he has asked the same question that he asked at the last meeting of the House without making clear. He has asked as at 30<sup>th</sup> September and that is the same question that he asked last time so he has the information. He is now saying 'well is it possible that since then more schedules, as at 30<sup>th</sup> September,



have been submitted?' but we would need notice of that. The answer is that there might have been but as to how many it is not clear.

**NO. 1129 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – NON-EU PENSIONERS**

Are non-EU pensioners with residence permits to remain in Gibraltar eligible to apply for the minimum income guarantee?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Any person who is residing in Gibraltar and has either a certificate of permanent residence or holds a residence permit, which at the date of issue was valid for a period in excess of one year, is eligible to apply for the minimum income guarantee.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1129 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then the answer is no, there are no EU pensioners with residence permits to remain in Gibraltar with either a certificate of permanent residence or more than one year, or is it that the answer is that the Minister does not know whether there are or there are not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that that is a non sequitur. He is asking are non-EU pensioners with residence permits to remain in Gibraltar eligible to apply for the minimum income guarantee. In other words, if one is a non-EU pensioner, a Moroccan for example, and he has notwithstanding that he is a pensioner a residence permit to remain in Gibraltar, is he then eligible to apply for a minimum income guarantee, that is his question to which the answer is that any person who is residing in Gibraltar, provided he has a certificate of permanent residence or holds a residence permit which at the date of issue was valid for a period in excess of one year, is eligible for the minimum income guarantee and therefore the question that he is now asking, but it does not arise from the answer, he is now asking whether are there any such non-EU pensioners and I think this issue would be better debated, there is another question on the Order Paper which he has put in terms of whether the Government intend to change any Immigration Ordinance provisions, which I think is the other half of the point he is getting at with this question. The answer is that I think there are pensioners in Gibraltar with residence permits but they would be working, they would be seeking employment. I think that is the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The eligibility to the minimum income guarantee is age driven and means tested. Presumably a pensioner can be working and not earning enough.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes it is possible.

ORAL

**NO. 1130 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in each of the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1131 to 1135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1131 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1130 and 1132 to 1135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1132 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for October and November 2005, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1130, 1131 and 1133 to 1135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1133 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in October and November 2005 from the Closed Long-Term benefits Fund, giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners, showing the number of Gibraltar/UK Nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each of the two months in Question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1130 to 1132, 1134 and 1135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1134 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1130 to 1133 and 1135 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1135 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1135 /2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1130 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in each of the months of October to November 2005 is as follows:

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

	<u>31-Oct-05</u>	<u>30-Nov-05</u>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>		
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£4,552,936	£4,512,858
 <u>Add</u>		
Receipts	£37,845	£4,533
	<u>£4,590,781</u>	<u>£4,517,391</u>
 <u>Less</u>		
Payments	<u>(£77,923)</u>	<u>(£50,356)</u>
 <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£4,512,858</u>	<u>£4,467,035</u>

Cont'd...

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1135 /2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1131 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of October and November 2005 is as follows:

**SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

	<u>31-Oct-05</u>	<u>30-Nov-05</u>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>		
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£1,062,587	£1,080,038
<b><u>Add</u></b>		
Receipts	£89,768	£76,661
	<u>£1,152,355</u>	<u>£1,156,699</u>
 Payments	 (£72,317)	 (£78,291)
 <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	 <u>£1,080,038</u>	 <u>£1,078,408</u>

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1135 /2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1132 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for October and November 2005, showing the amounts from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds is as follows:

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<b><u>31-Oct-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Nov-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>		
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	<b><u>£596,844</u></b>	<b><u>£342,239</u></b>
<b><u>"Local Account"</u></b>		
Opening Balance	£131,196	£28,439
<u>Add</u>		
Transfers from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund	£800,000	£900,000
Other Receipts	<u>£4,206</u>	<u>£119</u>
	<u>£935,402</u>	<u>£928,558</u>
<u>Less</u>		
Pension Payments	<u>(£906,963)</u>	<u>(£897,195)</u>
Closing Balance	<u>£28,439</u>	<u>£31,363</u>
<b><u>"Spanish Account"</u></b>		
Opening Balance	£465,648	£313,800
<u>Add</u>		
Receipts from DFID	<u>£120,000</u>	<u>£130,000</u>
	<u>£585,648</u>	<u>£443,800</u>
<u>Less</u>		
Pension Payments	<u>(£271,848)</u>	<u>(£146,023)</u>
Closing Balance	<u>£313,800</u>	<u>£297,777</u>
<b><u>Fund Account</u></b>		
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<b><u>£342,239</u></b>	<b><u>£329,140</u></b>

Cont'd...

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1135 /2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1133 of 2005**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from October and November 2005.

	<b>Oct-05</b>	<b>Nov-05</b>
<b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>	6126	6112
<b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b>	5050	5058
<b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>	1646	1644
<b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>	460	466
<b>Total</b>	<b>13282</b>	<b>13280</b>

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1135 /2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1134 of 2005**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for October and November 2005, are as follows:

October 2005	£800,000
November 2005	£900,000
	<u>£1,700,000</u>

**Cont'd...**

**Cont'd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1135 /2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1135 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of October and November 2005 is as follows:

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<b><u>31-Oct-05</u></b>	<b><u>30-Nov-05</u></b>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>		
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£13,246,668	£13,441,970
<b><u>Add</u></b>		
Receipts	£1,093,135	£895,469
	<u>£14,339,803</u>	<u>£14,337,439</u>
Payments	<u>(£897,833)</u>	<u>(£995,769)</u>
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£13,441,970</u>	<u>£13,341,670</u>

ORAL

**NO. 1136 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state how many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of November 2005, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.



### Answer to Question 1136

75 Elderly citizens are awaiting a place in Mount Alvernia as at the end of November 2005.

23 are occupying a bed in St Bernard's Hospital (see table below).

#### Age Group

	60-65	66-70	71-75	76-80	81-85	86-90	91+
Males	1	1	1	5	7	5	3
Females	-	1	2	12	20	13	4

ORAL

NO. 1137 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**GHA – PRIMARY HEALTH CENTRE**

Can Government confirm that the doctors at the Primary Health Centre are providing pensioners over the age of 70 free of charge with the medical examination that they require to be able to renew their Driving Licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Yes.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1138 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DENTAL DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state what is the average waiting time for schoolchildren to be provided with dental braces by the Dental Department of the GHA?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1139, 1140, 1141 and 1142 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1139 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state the total number of outpatient attendances at the Primary Care Centre in the months of October and November 2005, keeping to the format given in answer to Question 66 of 2005 and additionally giving details of other departments if they are not shown there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1138, 1140, 1141 and 1142 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1140 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state the number of outpatient attendances at the Primary Care Centre, including the number of outpatients being attended to by District Nurses, Occupational Therapists and Physiotherapists in the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1138, 1139, 1141 and 1142 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1141 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GP ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP Attendances at the Primary Care Centre in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1138, 1139, 1140 and 1142 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1142 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many House Calls were attended to by Health Centre Doctors in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1142 of 2005**

**Answer to question 1138**

Orthodontic Treatment	Waiting Time
Severe Malocclusion	6 weeks
Mild to moderate Treatment	2 years

**Answer to Questions 1139 to 1142**

DEPARTMENT	Oct-05	Nov-05	TOTAL
AUDIOLOGY	151	193	344
DIETICIAN	87	90	177
CLINIC SISTER	2738	1823	4,561
SCHOOL HEALTH	312	402	714
SPEECH & LANGUAGE	132	177	309
MENTAL WELFARE	224	216	440
GP CLINIC	8086	8279	16,365
HOUSE CALLS *	347	324	671
DENTAL	1443	1199	2,642
CHILD WELFARE	991	912	1,903
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	1231	1139	2,370
DERMATOLOGIST	91	0	91
CRYOTHERAPY	77	116	193
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15910</b>	<b>14,870</b>	<b>30,780</b>

Calls received during working hours are recorded until 4.00p.m. Night calls do not form part of these statistics.

**COMMUNITY**

PHYSIO	184	167	351
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY	171	196	367
DISTRICT	2206	1066	3,272
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,561</b>	<b>1429</b>	<b>3,990</b>



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1138 TO 1142 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Are Government happy with the delay of two years for mild to moderate treatment and what do the Government intend to do to improve this?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, Government are not happy and the GHA is currently considering the situation and will be putting proposals to Government.

**NO. 1143 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GHA – PATIENT RECORDS**

Can Government state on how many occasions patients of the GHA at either the Primary Care Centre or St Bernard's Hospital have had appointments cancelled or not proceeded with as a result of the patient's notes having been lost or misplaced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The GHA does not maintain records of outpatient appointments that may have been delayed or postponed.

In Primary Care every effort is made to ensure that the patient has access to a GP. When notes are not immediately available, the GP will usually record the consultation on a 'Temporary Card', and this will be subsequently included in the patient's notes once these have been traced.

Historically, unavailability of notes has been a more acute problem at St Bernard's Hospital. By historically I mean beyond the life of this administration going back to when the Opposition Members were in Government.

The performance at the old Hospital was averaging between 70 per cent to 80 per cent as a percentage of records delivered against those requested.

Key Performance Indicators and weekly Audits were introduced in April this year as part of a range of quality improvement measures following the move into the new facility.

As a result of the introduction of these improvement measures, the performance of the Medical Records Department has improved dramatically over the last nine months. The results are really quite impressive. Three months into the new facility the unit's performance was up from approximately 70 per cent – 80 per cent to about 90 per cent. Over the last six months performance has further improved and has now reached approximately 96 per cent. The number of clinics, it should be noted, has also gone up by 70 per cent over the same period. Notwithstanding this significant increase in clinics the Medical Records Department has managed to improve their performance month on month.

As can be seen by the progress achieved so far, every effort is being made to bring the incidence of files temporarily unavailable to the absolute minimum. In order to assist achieving even higher levels of success, the GHA has introduced an Electronic

tagging and tracking system. Commissioning of this system commenced on 28<sup>th</sup> November.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1143 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us how it is that without keeping a record of the occasions on when the notes are lost he is able to tell us that there has been a 96 per cent improvement in the record of performance?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The question was can Government state on how many occasions patients have had their appointments cancelled or not proceeded with, that is a totally different matter to the information I have given him in terms of the number of records that have been not available at a particular moment in time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Very well, then perhaps the Minister might tell us why in the 10 years his administration has been in charge of the Government of Gibraltar it has taken them nine years to produce the beginnings of an improvement, given that he has told us that there has been a 96 per cent improvement in the past nine months?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not know, maybe I should ask him why it took them 12 years when in Government not to find an answer. So I think we are still ahead of them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps the Minister could tell us what 12 years he is referring to, given that the GSLP was only in Government between 1988 and 1996?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well I think if pushed it could be more than 12 years because this matter has not been tackled until now when this Government have tackled it. The problem has existed forever and ever.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question I am asking him in respect of his responsibilities are why it has taken the administration of which he is a Member, nine years and a bit to decide that this was an issue that had to be dealt with? Will he grace this House with an answer to that question?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The best answer I can give him is that he should be congratulating me for raising it from 70 per cent to 80 per cent which is what it has always been historically, to 96 per cent to what it is now. How long it has taken is irrelevant to the success that has been achieved.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister had an opportunity of making a party political broadcast last night to the whole population of Gibraltar, he need not repeat it today. What I would tell him is this, does he share my concern that two members of the same family, despite the incredible statistics that he appears to quote for which I would congratulate him if I were able to verify it, might have found that two separate members of that family, one in the Primary Care Health Centre and the other one at the Hospital, had their notes misplaced and their appointments cancelled as a result only last week within 48 hours of each other?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I will not be satisfied with the situation until the 96 per cent becomes 99.9 per cent because perfection is more difficult to achieve. Of course I am concerned that any appointment is cancelled, of course the GHA is doing everything possible to remedy the situation. I take no pride in saying that 4 per cent of our records are still not traced and I reiterate we are doing everything we possibly we can, including the electronic method of tracing, to eliminate this problem. I hope, because it is too early to say yet as the hon Member will have seen, we only started commissioning it a few days ago but I hope that the new electronic method of tagging, which in effect what it does is it tells us or is supposed to tell us when a record leaves the Records Office, it triggers off the electronic tagging and the process is being developed so that if it moves from the location to where it was going to a subsequent location there is a subsequent trace put on it, and this comes back to the Records Office and in theory once the system is working the way it should be, we should be able to trace where the record is if it is not where it is supposed to be. Of course, getting there I could not at this moment say whether it will happen within three days, three weeks or three months. That is what we are trying to do.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact we have heard about this system before, we have been hearing about this system for some time, it appears to be a system that might achieve the desired result, we will have to wait to judge it once it is in operation. I warn the Minister that I am armed with the dictionary definition of the word 'soon' in case I have another encounter with the Minister for the Environment later. Can he tell us simply this, having commissioned the system fairly recently when he expects the system to be in operation?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The system is in operation already, by commissioning I mean it started and we are now evaluating the process. So it is a little bit like the scanner unit I inaugurated

yesterday, it was commissioned two months ago and we have put 105 patients through it during the commissioning process, during which everything has been working as it was supposed to be working and is now officially working after the inauguration. Similarly, with the records process, we have started it but I suppose in a way it is a little bit of insurance in case something goes wrong we can still say it is still being commissioned and it is not fully inaugurated.

ORAL

**NO. 1144 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – AVIAN FLU**

Can Government state the date the order for the 7,000 units of Tamiflu was placed, the date of their delivery to the GHA and the cost of the order?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1145 and 1146 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1145 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – AVIAN FLU**

Can Government state whether an additional order has been placed for units of Tamiflu, and if so, state the date the order was placed, the date the order will be delivered to the GHA and the cost of the additional order?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1144 and 1146 of 2005.

**NO. 1146 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – AVIAN FLU**

Can Government provide details of the Contingency Plan the GHA have in place to combat the effect of Avian Flu affecting Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

As the hon Member will be aware from the Government's public statements, the Government's Civil Contingency Committee ("C3" as it is known) has established an Avian Flu group to deal with all aspects of the possible threat to Gibraltar from Avian Flu should it affect Gibraltar in the future. Although the question makes reference to "Avian Flu affecting Gibraltar", as he knows this is not currently the case.

The GHA is part of C3's Avian Flu group and is responsible for the medical aspects of the contingency planning. There are of course other aspects on which other departments and agencies lead. The GHA's contingency planning is on-going and the acquisition of Tamiflu forms just one part of it. It is not appropriate to give details of the GHA's plan until they have been submitted to and approved by C3 and then incorporated into the overall contingency plan.

I can tell the hon Member that an order for 7,000 units of Tamiflu was placed on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2005 at a cost of £85,330 and the arrival of the medicine, of the drugs in Gibraltar is scheduled for the end of March 2006. An additional order of 21,000 units of Tamiflu was placed on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2005 at a cost of £255,990 and it has an expected arrival of December 2006.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1144 TO 1146 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister state when he expects C3 to conclude the plan?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No I cannot. By definition from the answer I have given him C3 needs to combine the input from a number of departments, not just from the GHA, and this is being coordinated from No. 6 Convent Place and therefore until all the input comes in from all the departments, C3 will not be in a position to finalise the details concerned.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1147 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of October and November 2005, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1148, 1154, 1155 and 1156 of 2005.

**NO. 1148 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of October and November 2005 of the beds occupied by Elderly Persons who have been formally discharged from St Bernard's Hospital how many fell into each of the 3 categories identified by the Government specifying sex and age:

1. Elderly persons living alone;
2. Elderly persons needing support; and
3. Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1147, 1154, 1155 and 1156 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1149 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as Sponsored Patients, in the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1150, 1151 and 1152 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1150 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can Government state how much was spent by the GHA with regards to patients being sent to Malaga Clinic for scans in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1149, 1151 and 1152 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1151 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS TO UK**

Can Government state the number of patient referrals to the UK in the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1149, 1150 and 1152 of 2005.

**NO. 1152 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state the number of patient referrals to the UK in the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1152 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1149**

66 patients were sponsored for treatment in Spain during the months of October and November 2005.

**Answer to Question 1150**

The amount spent by the GHA with regard to patients being sent to Malaga Clinics for scans in October and November 2005 was as follows:

October	=	£1997.13
November	=	£2099.88

**Answer to Question 1151**

There were 244 patient referrals attending the UK during the months of October and November.

**Answer to Question 1152**

227 sponsored patients were treated in the UK during the months of October and November.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1153 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MRSA INFECTION**

Can Government state whether cases of MRSA Infection have been detected at St Bernard's Hospital in the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Three cases were imported into Gibraltar and one case arose within St Bernard's Hospital in the months of October and November 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1153 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Of the one that was within St Bernard's Hospital, has the GHA been able to determine the source of the infection and how it was passed on to the patient? Was it through equipment or.....?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I do not have that sort of information available. I suspect it would verge on the limits of patient confidentiality but in any case I have not asked for that supplementary information and it is not available to me.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1154 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1147, 1148, 1155 and 1156 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1155 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many non-entitled patients have been admitted to St Bernard's Hospital during the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1147, 1148, 1154 and 1156 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1156 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1156 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1147 of 2005**

The number of elderly patients at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of October and end of November 2005 were as follows:-

October:

Age	Male	Female
65-70	2	5
71-80	7	16
81-90	10	14
91-100	0	2

November:

Age	Male	Female
65-70	4	4
71-80	7	17
81-90	12	10
91-100	0	1

**Answer to Question 1148 of 2005**

1: Elderly patients formally discharged:

October		
Age	Male	Female
71-80	0	1
81-90	1	3

November		
AGE	Male	Female
71-80	0	1
81-90	1	3

2: All elderly patients require some sort of support be it physical, psychological or social.

3: All patients who have been formally discharged are able to be looked after.

Contd.

**Contd Answer to Question 1156 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1154 of 2005**

The total number of Out-Patient attendances during the period in question were as follows:-

2005	Clinics	A&E			Physiotherapy
		Clinics	Dressings	Plasters	
October	1563	1995	533	40	590
November	1999	1699	425	60	707

**Answer to Question 1155 of 2005**

The number of non-entitled patients admitted to St Bernard's during the period in question is as follows:-

October:	7
November:	11

**Answer to Question 1156 of 2005**

The total number of In-patient admissions during the months of October and November is as follows:-

October:	402
November:	395

The average number of patients per day during the months of October and November is as follows:

October:	104
November:	115

**ORAL**

**NO. 1157 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF OPERATIONS**

Can Government state how many operations were performed in St Bernard's Hospital at Europort in October and November 2005, by specialists, specifying which were elective and which were emergencies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1158 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1158 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons were waiting for elective surgery in each speciality as end November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1158 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1157**

Elective operations performed:

	<b>October 2005</b>	<b>November 2005</b>
General Surgery	72	79
Gynaecology/Obstetrics	16	25
Ophthalmology	29	30
Orthodontics	10	20
Orthopaedics	18	36
Otorhinolaryngology	27	20
Pain Relief	5	4
Plastic Surgery	0	4
Psychiatry	1	3
Spinals	3	0
Total	181	221

Emergency operations performed

	<b>October 2005</b>	<b>November 2005</b>
General Surgery	7	6
Gynaecology/Obstetrics	9	5
Medical	0	1
Orthodontics	0	3
Orthopaedics	8	5
Otorhinolaryngology	1	0
Total	25	20

Contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1158 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1158**

**Elective Surgery Waiting Lists**

General Surgery	272
Orthopaedics	288
Ophthalmology	46
Gynaecology	42
Otorhinolaryngology	168
Orthodontics	184
Plastic Surgery	155



**NO. 1159 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been lodged with the new Independent Review Panel in the months of October and November 2005, by users of the Health Service, specifying the date of each complaint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

There have been no complaints lodged with the Independent Review Panel during the months of October and November 2005. For the avoidance of doubt seeing that the Hon Miss Montegriffo is not here and the questions have been asked on her behalf, just to make sure that there is no confusion in the answer that I have given, the complaints process is divided into two parts. The complaints that are received initially are received by the GHA and during the period there have been complaints to the GHA. I have answered that there have been no complaints lodged with the Independent Review Panel, which is correct, but for the avoidance of doubt the process is that complaints are lodged with GHA and they go through the process and if the complainant is not satisfied then he or she has recourse of going to the Independent Review Panel. It is this second phase which I am answering in this question. I assume the hon Member is familiar with this because I notice that there is no Question in the Order Paper, there usually is, on complaints during the same period so for the avoidance of doubt that is why I have given the additional explanation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1159 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

If the Minister has the information available it would be welcome.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes indeed, during that same period there were 11 formal complaints and 23 verbal complaints or informal complaints. I would also add that during that same period there were 57 expressions of commendations made to GHA against the 34 complaints.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Were the 57 expressions verbal or in writing?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The expressions of commendations vary. It can vary from boxes of chocolates to bouquets of flower, to letters actually expressing, it is all basically saying 'thank you, well done' in one form or the other.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is the Minister a recipient of any of the boxes of chocolates?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, but the Minister is the recipient of letters which he then passes on to the Complaints Officer which are then counted in these figures. I do get letters congratulating GHA for this and that, just as I get letters not congratulating GHA for that and the other.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would like to ask the Minister, when he tells us that there are 57 expressions of gratitude of positiveness to the GHA but some of those expressions are boxes of chocolates, is each box of chocolates counted as one or is each chocolate counted individually to make up the 57?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Just to say that our audit system is very scrupulous to give us correct answers as possible.

**NO. 1160 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – TV SETS**

When do Government expect to repair or replace the TV sets that are not functioning in the wards at St Bernard's Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

In February 2005 the GHA entered into an agreement with a UK based company to provide a Bedside Patient Entertainment System. The objective is to give patients access to a range of television channels and digital radio.

The contracted company went into receivership earlier this year leaving the TV system partially installed and in its commissioning stage. The GHA entered into negotiations with an alternate supplier of the same equipment in UK once matters had been settled with the UK Liquidators.

During this process, the GHA decided to start to provide the facility to patients even though the Contractor had not completed the works towards making the system fully operational. Approximately 90 per cent of the TV's are operational and are keeping patients entertained and relaxed by the present selection of television and radio services. However, TV sets, the House will be as interested in hearing as I was, are becoming un-operational, without any technical fault developing, because we have a new phenomenon developing and an average of 30 video leads and an average of 10 remote controls are disappearing every month.

The GHA is finalising negotiations with the UK company to bring the project to completion. We will be asking for additional works to make the system, as far as possible, tamper proof and to try to replace the video links in a way that they are not so easily removable.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1160 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask the Minister, again I have heard it said on a number of occasions and one of the great things about the hospital is that every patient has his own video

screen et cetera, can he confirm that in fact only 90 per cent of patients as a result of his answer have a working video screen?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that is the figure that I have been given, that 90 per cent of TVs are operational, I am not sure but I am practically certain that that includes some beds where a TV set is not yet installed. So it is not just that there is a TV set there and it is not working, in some cases it may not be there at all. I hasten to add that there is very few of those.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1161 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – RENTAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTIES**

Can Government state whether they have finalised their consideration of the appropriate way to deal with the sub-letting to the GHA properties at Harbour Views, Montagu Gardens and West View Park, where sub-letting is prohibited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1166 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1162 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government state how many of the recommendations included in the reports of the Health Care Development Team have been accepted and how many have not been accepted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1163 to 1165 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1163 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – CLINICAL REPORT**

Can Government specify what were the transitional management services which the clinical governance team provided to the GHA, which individuals were involved in what management functions, for what period of time and how much of the additional £550,000 funded in 2004/2005 was on this account?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1162, 1164 and 1165 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1164 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

When did Government receive the clinical services report by the Healthcare Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1162, 1163 and 1165 of 2005.



**NO. 1165 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government list the recommendations made by the Healthcare Development Team in the clinical services report in relation to laboratory services which have been accepted and incorporated in the GHA strategic plan?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1162 of 2005**

The nature of the work carried out by the Healthcare Development Programme cannot simply be viewed as a finite number of recommendations because it is a series of high-level proposals on structure, processes and practice. Many of these are fully integrated within the text of the work stream reports and not separately identified or quantified.

The constantly evolving nature of the programme and the linkage of a large number of recommendations means that it is impossible to quantify them accurately. The allocation of arbitrary numbers would not be representative of the progress made, would be inaccurate and grossly undervalue the importance of this programme.

The Government have given in principle approval to the work carried out by the Healthcare Development Team. The Health Authority is currently further developing some elements of the proposals submitted.

The GHA Executive has incorporated the accepted proposals into the strategic plan and the resulting objectives are being carefully and regularly monitored by the GHA and by the Government.

**Answer to Question No. 1163 of 2005**

Transitional Management Services provided by the Clinical Governance Team to the GHA were as follows:

- (a) Joint Chief Executive – Mr John Langan, and
- (b) Co-Director of Operational Service – Mr F McGurrin.

These services were provided between April and December 2004.

The transitional management services were an integral part of the extensions to the original brief and were not quantified separately. This was explained in my answer to Question No. 2171 of 2004.

The additional £550,000 funded in 2004/2005 took account of several aspects of the Review which included the transitional management costs. The Review was phased over a number of years. While the extent of the work and duration of phases had been generally agreed at the initial stages, a number of additional extensions to the original brief were agreed to on an on-going basis as work progressed. The Government were aware that by agreeing to proceed with the extensions as anticipated, additional funding would need to be appropriated as indeed was the case.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1164 and 1165 of 2005**

It is the policy of the Government not to publish the Healthcare Development Team Report on Work Stream No. 18 on the clinical reviews which was received by Government on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2005. However, I can tell the hon Member that all the recommendations of the Healthcare Development Team as they relate to Laboratory services have been incorporated into the objectives of the Laboratories for the next three years.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1162 TO 1165 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say whether the recommendations involved any changes in the manning levels of the laboratory, and if so if they have been incorporated have extra jobs been identified and are being recruited or what is the state of play? Assuming that there is a manning level recommendation.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, from the synopsis in front of me there is no recommendation to increase or decrease manning levels. No recommendations on manning levels at all, nothing on increasing of manning levels.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there anything then in those recommendations that have been accepted and are being implemented that involves additional funding?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Off the top of my head I would say that most of the reports, in one form or the other, have additional funding implications. I am sure this one has and I will not go through the whole list again but yes, there are additional funding implications in most of the Work Stream reports.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If the Minister says the policy is not to identify specifically what is being accepted and incorporated, is he willing to tell us what are the extra costs that will be incurred as a result of accepting and implementing these recommendations?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It is difficult because of the same problem, there are so many different aspects of this that it is difficult to quantify them separately. Many of these recommendations form part of the on-going changes that are taking place. For example, we were talking about tracking of records before and I am sure that somewhere along the line the Healthcare Development Team may have said something about that. Now that has been taken on board and has been implemented. Of course there are financial implications. Now those financial implications will have been taken partly on board out of the budget for this year and if they are bigger than the budget for this year allows then they will be incorporated into the financing for next year. But there will not be a column saying 'Healthcare Development Team', I am not trying to be unhelpful but it is just not the way the beast is constructed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In taking a decision as to whether something is going to be accepted and incorporated and carried out, is no evaluation made at that point in time of what the financial implications of those recommendations are? I have difficulty in seeing how the people who prepare the paper for the Minister to take a policy decision and make a recommendation, make a recommendation without putting a figure next to it.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The way it is actually worked in practice is that the Healthcare Development Team have produced a report on a particular area, wherever that particular area of GHA is, the Government have discussed the report with them and the report, as I said in my answer, most of the reports have been accepted in principle. The work of the Healthcare Development Team did not include costing of each part of the report or of the recommendations. Once the Government have accepted in principle, as they have, the GHA now has to look at ways and means of doing the strategic goals that have been set and the strategic planning. It is at that stage that the costings arise. We then go back to Government at the Estimates stage and say we want to have 20 bottles instead of five bottles and it is at that stage that the cost implications will be studied as and when they arise. It is such a massive exercise and such a lot of different things that a lot of it disappears in the general funding of the GHA anyway. There are issues which emerge, supposing the scanner system had been one of those recommendations, then that one can be identified but the reality is that the majority of the things that these reports produce are day to day on-going management measures to improve output, improve techniques or introduce new strategies and it is very difficult to pinpoint and say that they have recommended this and it is going to cost this, it is a much bigger enterprise.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can understand that if what happens is that somebody looks at the way that something is being done and suggests a different way of doing the thing, that need not necessarily mean that doing it differently is going to cost more than the way it was being done before, but I am asking the Minister to address the part that does involve money because in one of his earlier supplementaries he said, 'yes there were cost implications in these things'. I would assume that if something new is being undertaken or if what is being undertaken is to do something that was being done already but in a different way which was supposed to produce a benefit, then there would have been a cost benefit analysis of what it is going to cost to produce that benefit if there is a cost element. If there is no cost then it is fair enough but if one is going to say, 'well look, people are going to get told something five minutes earlier than they would have done with the old system' and that extra five minutes is going to raise the operating cost of the Health Service by a few hundreds or a few thousands, the decision I would imagine on policy grounds would be that it was good value for money, if one gets that benefit for a few hundred pounds then it is not necessarily the same as if it is ten times as expensive. At least part of this work must involve that kind of analysis.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that is what I was trying to say before, that the analysis takes place mostly in conjunction with the submissions of bids for the next estimates and at the last estimates. In some cases the analysis is made and if it can be incorporated then it is incorporated into current funding even if there is an increase in level of costs. Take for example the scheduling process, that had manning implications to it but the stages that we have gone through already have been done by shuffling people around and by making use of the extra resources that have been brought in. In answer to a previous question in an earlier meeting of the House I detailed over a hundred extra posts that had been created. Some of those may have been but most of them were not specific to doing any specific thing, especially on the clerical side, so it is extremely difficult to pinpoint in and put it in easily identifiable folders or files and say 'they recommended that we paint that wall yellow and the tin of paint is going to cost so much, the brush is going to cost so much and the paint is going to cost so much', the cost analysis is that. There are very few of these that can be separated, in many cases it is just a question of saying we need more funds for this and more funds for that and the analysis is done by GHA and the Government then decide at that stage, 'yes we will provide the funding or not', or 'no it has to be done with less funding'. The hon Member knows the system better than I do.

**NO. 1166 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SUB-HEAD 22**

Can Government confirm what is the expenditure figure to November 2005 for accommodation under subhead 22 for the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1161 of 2005**

The Government have made a policy decision that GHA should discontinue its practice of renting accommodation in areas such as Harbour Views, Montagu Gardens and West View Park where there are lease restrictions on sub-letting. GHA staff will move to other accommodation when their current short-term Lease Agreement expire and suitable alternative accommodation is identified.

**Answer to Question No. 1166 of 2005**

The expenditure figure as at 30 November 2005 for accommodation under Subhead 22 for the current financial year was £298,501.36.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1161 AND 1166 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us when the longest of those short-term agreements comes to an end?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, there is one ending at the end of December, four at the end of March, one at the end of May and one in July, so July is the last one.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am sure that the Minister will want to agree with me that this is one of those instances when scrutiny in this House actually led to determining that that was happening and that all sides of the House agreed that the solution now proposed is one which we all think is the appropriate one.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes indeed it was scrutiny in this House that brought this to light.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1167 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 4 to 8 of 2005/2006 in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to the dispensing pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1168 to 1172 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1168 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2005/06?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167 and 1169 to 1172 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1169 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items and which pay a total of £7.50 for the accounting periods 4 to 8 of 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167, 1168 and 1170 to 1172 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1170 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to Pharmacists for periods 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2005/06?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167 to 1169, 1171 and 1172 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1171 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENT TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees for periods 4 to 8 of 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167 to 1170 and 1172 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1172 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENT TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for the periods 4 to 8 of 2005/06, and the comparable figure for the same periods in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1172 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1167**

	05/06	05/06
Period	4	5
Prescriptions	5470	5796
Items	10447	11314

**Answer to Question 1168**

	05/06	05/06
Period	4	5
Prescriptions	12419	13258
Items	45605	50222
Cost	£493,155.51	£517,154.22

**Answer to Question 1169**

	05/06	05/06
Period	4	5
No. of items	3681	4149

The foregoing is in respect of completed periods only. Some accounts are yet to be submitted in respect of periods 6,7 and 8 of 2005/2006.

**Answer to Question 1170**

	05/06	05/06
PERIOD	4	5
	£549,127.01	£579,268.82

**Answer to Questions 1171 and 1172**

2005/06	04/05	04/05	05/06	05/06
PERIOD	4	5	4	5
	£88,977.6	£78570.00	£82,089.00	£90,399.60

**ORAL**

**NO. 1173 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for study leave up to the end of November 2005, which is included in subhead 30, School of Health Studies of the GHA?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The total expenditure for study leave under sub-head 30 to the end of November 2005 was £80,303.76.

ORAL

**NO. 1174 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA - CLEANERS**

Can Government state how many permanent posts of cleaners there are in St Bernard's Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1175 to 1177 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1175 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA - CLEANERS**

Can Government confirm that in addition to the permanent posts of cleaners in St Bernard's Hospital the Gibraltar Health Authority employs supply cleaners and if so give the total number of supply cleaners and a breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1174, 1176 and 1177 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1176 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government state how many nurses were in post as at the end of November 2005, giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1174, 1175 and 1177 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1177 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can Government state the number of contract nurses employed by the GHA as at the end of November 2005, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1177 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1174**

The number of permanent post cleaners working at St Bernard's is as follows:-

	Working at St Bernard's
Full-time	23
Part-time	49

**Answer to Question 1175**

The Gibraltar Health Authority currently has a total of 37 cleaners on the Supply List and their breakdown by nationality is as follows:

16	Spanish nationals
12	British – Gibraltarian nationals
7	British nationals
1	Portuguese nationals
1	Moroccan nationals

Contd

**Contd Answer to Question 1177 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1176**

The following is a breakdown by grade of nurses in post as at the end of November 2005:

<b>Director of Nursing &amp; Patient Services</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Deputy Director of Nursing Services</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Clinical Nurse Managers</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>Education Development Officer</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Senior Nurse Tutor</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Nurse Lecturer</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Nurse Practitioners</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Charge Nurses</b>	<b>33</b>	
<b>Staff Nurses</b>		
112 Full-timers	}	<b>127</b>
8 Part-timers (4 Full-time equivalents)		
<b>Midwives</b>	}	
9 Full-timers		
4 Part-timers (2 Full-time equivalent)		
<b>Operating Department Practitioners</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>Senior Enrolled Nurses</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>Enrolled Nurses</b>		
81 Full-timers		<b>88</b>
14 Part-timers (7 Full-time equivalents)		
<b>Nursing Auxiliaries</b>	}	<b>95.5</b>
9 Full-timers		
1 Part-timer (0.5 Full-time equivalent)		
<b>Nursing Assistants</b>		
78 Full-timers		
10 Part-timers (5 Full-time equivalent)		
4 (28 hours) (3 Full-time equivalent)		

Contd.

**Contd Answer to Question 1177 of 2005**

**Answer to question 1177**

The following is a breakdown of contract nurses employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority by speciality as at the end of November 2005:

Director of Nursing & Patient Services	1
Education Development Officer	1
Nurse Lecturer	1
Nurse Practitioners	2
Charge Nurses	2
Staff Nurses	25
Staff Nurses (part-time)	1
Registered Sick Children's Nurses	5
Registered Mental Nurses	5
Theatre Nurses	2
Midwives	9
Midwives (part-time)	2
Operating Department Practitioners	5
Enrolled Nurses	3

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1174 TO 1177 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The schedule shows that there are 23 full-time cleaners in St Bernard's Hospital and that there are 37 cleaners on the supply list, do the supply cleaners cover full-time or part-time jobs or both?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I assume they cover both, I do not see any reason why they should cover one or the other. The short answer is that I do not know exactly. They obviously cover the full timers, the part timers I suppose if just one is missing it is not so important but if more than one part timer is missing then I think the answer has to be that they cover both but I cannot guarantee the accuracy of that answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the supply cleaners directly employed by the GHA or do the GHA have a contractor that provide the supply cleaners?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Directly employed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that the GHA now have difficulty in recruiting local residents to be cleaners, given that there are 16 Spanish nationals employed as supply cleaners in the Health Authority?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I remember asking a similar question myself. In reality the applications for cleaners are quite numerous whenever vacancies are advertised. The last time I saw the figures there were something like 15 posts and there had been 75 applications, that sort of scale. Applications of all nationalities. At the end of the day, where possible, people are chosen bearing in mind the criteria that the hon Member said a moment ago but we do choose people who are the best at doing the job, and if the Gibraltarian is able to do the job and suited and qualified to do the job then that preference is given. We get many applicants who do not meet the criteria required.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has something happened, to the Minister's knowledge, that has produced a sudden decline in the cleaning skills of Gibraltarians since we always seem to have managed, in Government at least, to keep places clean using Gibraltarians to do the cleaning and on this occasion we are talking about 12 Gibraltarians out of 37 supply

cleaners on the list? That is to say, the Gibraltarians are now less than one third of the people on the supply list. If the Minister tries to convince this House that this is based on ability there has been a sudden decline in the ability to clean amongst Gibraltarians presumably.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is not what I said. To answer his first question, no, I am not aware of any such decline. Secondly, the implication of that supplementary question is not in line with what I said. What I said is that irrespective of nationality, because of the nature of the job, many people apply who are not suitable, irrespective of nationality but when it comes to actually accepting, bearing in mind the constrictions that we are under in terms of EU nationals, where preference cannot be given on grounds of nationality and of course is not given on grounds of nationality, bearing in mind those constrictions, where possible, Gibraltarians are always employed and being supply cleaners obviously the list is larger than the demand at any given time. I have no idea how many of these 37 are called upon to supply at any given moment in time but I suspect the number is of 10 per cent or 15 per cent rather than the 80 per cent or 90 per cent, so I assume that when the supply list is drawn up it is better to have as many as possible because when the time comes people who are on the supply list may not necessarily be available.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So is the Minister then saying that the complement of cleaners is fully occupied by the permanent cleaners and that in fact if everybody was working there would be no need to draw any of the 37 supply. That is to say, that in order to maintain every position covered in the hospital at any one time what is required are 49 part-timers and 23 full-timers, is that the position?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that is my understanding, that supply cleaners are there to fill any temporary vacancy, with such a large number of people obviously there are people going sick, people who do not turn up, the usual reasons and the supply cleaners are there to fill those gaps. Given the full complement being present on any given day there should be no need for any supply cleaners, that is my understanding.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but I am sure the Minister has been in the job long enough to know that that is the theory and not always the practice. I am trying to establish whether he knows, for example, whether the formal figure in the Estimates that produced the wages for cleaners is that there are 23 and 49, because I think the Minister talks about temporary vacancies and I think there is a difference between the vacancy and the absence. That is to say, somebody can be absent from work and then needs a supply but once somebody leaves the job on retirement or whatever then it is no longer a temporary absence to be covered by a supply other than during the recruiting period. I am sure the Minister understands that I am aware that that is how the system is supposed to work but can he tell us that he knows that it is working like that or that he thinks that it is because that is how it should?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think the second is probably more accurate than the first. Having said that, the question was phrased in terms of permanent posts rather than persons so I take it that the answer that has been provided for me is of posts and not of people who are actually there today so that it does not take into account any vacancies. I am assuming that those figures are of posts. I am sure that in the process of giving me this answer someone mentioned that at this given moment in time there were one or two or three of that sort of scale posts that were temporarily vacant. Now whether those were being filled temporarily by supply cleaners or whether we have a waiting list of permanent people that we can bring in quickly, that I do not know. That is why we have a Management Supervisor and with those number of posts I could not possibly tell him exactly what is happening today or yesterday or the day before. Coming back to what I said initially, this is the way I think it is working because that is the way it should be working. If the hon Member has reason to think otherwise, then I would be happy to investigate. There certainly is not a policy to have, I am not sure what it is that he thinks is happening, but there is not a policy to do anything different to what I have said I think is the norm and that he believes to be the norm as well.



ORAL

**NO. 1178 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA - NURSES**

Can Government state whether there is still a requirement for nurses to be qualified at RGN level before obtaining a further qualification as RMN?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1179 of 2005.

**NO. 1179 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA - NURSES**

Can Government state whether there is still a requirement for nurses to be qualified at RGN level before obtaining a further qualification as Midwife?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 1178 and 1179 of 2005**

No, there is no requirement for nurses to be qualified at Registered General Nurse level before qualifying as a Midwife or as Registered Mental Nurse.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1178 AND 1179 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say when that requirement was discontinued?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Some years ago is the supplementary information that I have been given but I cannot say exactly, some years ago. The Nursing and Midwifery Council revised nurse training and there is now a direct entry course for students who wish to pursue a career, this is midwifery and in terms of mental nurses there is no mention of the time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was this requirement when it was in place a UK requirement or a Gibraltar requirement?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would need notice of that question, I have no idea.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Perhaps the Minister would look into how the change came about because there will be questions in a future House. Essentially what I am trying to establish are two things, precisely when the change took place and whether it was Gibraltar-driven because it was a Gibraltar thing that we could do away with or we were following UK practice because the UK changed its policy on this matter.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Can I suggest to the hon Member and my counterpart on health matters that it avoids confusion and saves time if I ask him to write to me asking the specific question and then I make sure that I answer what he wants to know rather than relying on memory or on a scribbled note, but I would be more than delighted to give him the information.

**NO. 1180 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA - ANAESTHETIST**

Can Government state whether any Anaesthetists or Consultants resigned from the GHA during the current calendar year, and if so, were any re-engaged as Locums?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

One Anaesthetist resigned on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2005 but continued doing the job during the month of November. The recruitment procedure to replace him and also to increase the complement of Anaesthetists to six is already under way.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1180 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

For the month of November was he employed as a Locum and at locum rates?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The answer to that is yes and no. He was employed as a locum by definition of what the word locum means, because he was replacing someone, but he was not employed at locum rates.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

So in fact he was paid the monthly salary he would have earned had he not resigned?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, he was asked whether he could stay by GHA and a rate was negotiated which was somewhere in between his previous base rate, because this is where it starts getting complicated, and what the locum rate would have been. It works out to about three quarters or two thirds of the locum rate and above what he was getting. However, if one takes into account the fact that he was on a, like all consultants on contract, a gratuity after a successful three year completion of the contract and if one

takes into account his allowances and so on, the gap narrows considerably. On some argument on the figures one could almost say that he was earning less than if he had continued on his contract.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Would the Minister confirm that because he resigned he was therefore not entitled to the terminal gratuity which normally consultants are entitled to at the end of their contract?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes I can confirm that by terminating his contract prematurely he is not entitled to the gratuity.

ORAL

**NO. 1181 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GENERAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether they have now finalised the discussions with the General Practitioners regarding their job description?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Discussions with the General Practitioners regarding their job description are on-going and have not yet been finalised.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1182 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

(On behalf of The Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Psycho-Geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV during the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Three psycho-geriatric patients were admitted in KGV during the month of October 2005, all of whom were subsequently discharged.

There were no psycho-geriatric patient admissions in November 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1183 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NUMBER OF PUPILS LEAVING SCHOOL**

Can Government state how many pupils left school in the 2004/2005 academic year at the age of 15 giving a breakdown by school and term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1184 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1184 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NUMBER OF PUPILS SUSPENDED**

Can Government state how many pupils were suspended from school in the 2004/2005 academic year and 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1184 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1183**

School	Autumn Term	Spring Term	Summer Term	Total
Bayside	2	1	2	5
Westside	7	8	12	27

**Answer to Question 1184**

Number of pupils suspended from school

School	2004/5	2005/6 (as at 5 12 05)
Notre Dame	0	1*
St Paul's	0	0
St Mary's	3*	0
St Joseph's First	2*	0
ST Bernard's First	0	0
Governor's Meadow	1	0
Bishop Fitzgerald	1	0
St Anne's	3	-
St Joseph's Middle	0	0
Sacred Heart	3	1
Hebrew	0	0
Bayside	92	14
Westside	22	5

\*Lunchtime only – 1 for a short period

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1183 AND 1184 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister explain the high number of boys that were suspended, 92 in the academic year?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will explain a number of things. The main one is that these are recidivists, re-offending as the hon Member put it, it is not 92 children who were suspended it is somehow the recidivists who keep getting into trouble. Also that some of the suspensions depend really on the way the concept has been taken by the headteachers who reported on this. In some cases it is really an afternoon or whatever it is rather than exclusion as such.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I think we had this debate in a previous House and I would just like to see whether the situation has changed or has altered in any way. Is it that the pupils who are suspended from school, do they continue education? What sort of provision is made for a student who at the age of 13 or 14 is suspended from school say for two weeks? What are the provisions for that child for those two weeks in relation to education?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, I am sure and I am assured by headteachers that work is set and attention is given in a whole variety of ways suited to the type of student. In some cases with the Youth Office, in some cases they can rely on parents to be on top of the situation. When they see that parents are going to be on top of the situation they actually assign a teacher to help the child through, make appointments for the child to see a teacher and I am assured that they do in no way, it would be totally unacceptable for a child to get excluded for any length of time without continuing in different strategies to attend to his continued education.

**HON S E LINARES:**

What provisions are made for any type of behavioural modification of the child? Are there any courses or any programmes, or any consultancy type of thing that they can be given in order to modify their behaviour?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, we have a BEST team. The BEST team is essentially a behaviour modification service attending to specific and particular pupils, as I say with experts actually counselling, counselling is a very broad word as well but certainly helping the child to adopt different styles and different habits et cetera, the social background also.

Many problems, as the hon Member will know, emanate from the family background and the social background.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, I understand about the BEST programme being conducted within schools in order to modify the behaviour of children before they are suspended, I am talking about subsequently, after, when they are suspended, when they are told 'look, I am afraid you cannot come to school for the rest of the week or the next two days or three weeks', whatever it is. Apart from the work that is given to the student, and I understand that if responsibility is given to the parent sometimes the problem is the parent and the background so therefore there is no follow-up, what I am saying is, is there any type of course or programme that the student can go through whilst suspended because as I see it if the child is suspended and he is told basically not to come in for two weeks and he is given work, maybe they can do the work in an hour and then what happens to the rest of the 23 hours that they are out there? This is the issue. What I am trying to get at is whether there is anything that can be done during the time that they are suspended as in behavioural modification?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, it is not just work that is given it is also conditions, the child is suspended for a week or whatever but one of the conditions is that he has to call on a member of the BEST team at any particular time that the BEST team teacher is available. There are conditions set which I am absolutely sure that no headteacher absolutely just throws a child out of school and simply leaves him helpless and unattended, not only in terms of academic work but also in terms of relational counselling and helping to look at himself and his way forward.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister said the figures in answer to Question No. 1184 were the number of occasions when pupils have been suspended as opposed to the number of pupils that have been suspended. In fact the wording of the original question is asking for the number of pupils, does he have this figure as well or not?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have not got it with me, I apologise, but there has been confusion I accept. When we asked the headteachers to give us the statistics of the number of pupils they have come back and there has not been enough time to really work this one out with them. They have come up and I am assured that what it is is the number of occasions but I can of course investigate further and get the right number of pupils.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister, given his long familiarity not just since he has been in the House but even before, state whether there is any indication that this is on the increase or is it more or less stable?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

My assessment, and it is difficult really once one is away at a distance as I am now from being in the field as I was before, is that there is no dramatic downturn in the matter, the question of discipline, there are increasing pressures on our young people today especially the problem of drugs, family breakdown and though they have an impact and have an effect I certainly do not think there is a critical, crisis thing anyway.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask in relation to Question No. 1183, the number of youngsters leaving at the age of 15, the figure of five looks quite low when compared with 27 in Westside, has there always been that kind of difference that many more Westside pupils leave than Bayside ones?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, it has been a pattern. Perhaps one could investigate also the psychology of the whole thing, the motivation, the incentives, the career interests of boys and girls, if one looks at the figures that I gave last time for the year 2003/2004 we had exactly five for Bayside as well and we had 23 girls so there is a pattern. I have not gone further back than that but I think the Opposition Member will agree that there is a pattern.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Could it be that Bayside has a sort of one year programme, does Westside have one? If not it could well be that because they have not got that programme the girls tend to leave the school and find other ways of educating themselves or reforming themselves, or empowering themselves or whatever it is named?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I understand that Westside has plenty of provisions for girls who may not aspire to the GCSE's but nevertheless can go into a one year course in a variety of fields which are useful to them.

ORAL

**NO. 1185 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION**

Can Government give a breakdown of the adult education courses run by the Department of Education in the Gibraltar College of Further Education and Bleak House Training Institute?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1185 of 2005**

<b>Gibraltar College</b>		
<b>Current 30-week Courses</b>	<b>Current 10-week Courses</b>	<b>10 Week Courses (Jan 2006)</b>
English GCE	French Conversation	French Conversation
French GCSE	Introduction to Computers	German Beginners
Italian GCSE 1	MS Word Intermediate	Introduction to Computers
Italian GCSE 1	Spanish Beginners Group 1	MS Excel
Mathematics GCSE	Spanish Beginners Group 2	Sewing
Sociology A2		Spanish Beg.
Spanish GCSE		Spanish Beg. Continuation
TEFL 1		
TEFL 2		

**Bleak House (VTS)**

Adult Literacy (Levels 1 and 2)

Adult Numeracy (Levels 1 and 2)

Computer Literacy and Information Technology (CLAIT)(Levels 1 and 2)

English GCE

Other courses of a professional nature such as AAT, CMI, ACCA, CAT, ICSA, AQA Counselling Certificate etc, are run on a private basis using the facilities at Bleak House and the College.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1185 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just glancing through this what strikes me is that there is not any more adult education of the sort of leisure adult education. It seems more concentrated on certification like GCSE's English, French, Italian rather than what there used to be which was things like art, pottery, other skills and that type of adult education. Has that completely ceased or are there any other courses that are run, I remember that pottery comes to mind, my father used to do pottery and he used to spend an hour doing his pottery a week, are there not those courses any more?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Certainly they have not been recorded here so obviously they are not running. I do not know whether it is a question of supply or a question of demand. It could be also that in earlier years there was more of an interest in this type of leisure courses, there are so many leisure activities on the market these days, perhaps there is not a demand. I am not sure, I am speculating.



**NO. 1186 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRE-SCHOOL NURSERY**

Can Government say how many children attend Government pre-school Nursery Education this academic year giving a breakdown by nursery and by morning and afternoon sessions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1186 of 2005**

Name of Nursery	Numbers Enrolled	
	AM	PM
St Joseph's	41	15
Notre Dame	30	9
St Paul's	40	21
St Bernard's	40	-
Varyl Begg	31	17

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1186 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

By looking at this the first thing that comes to mind is are there the same number of staff for the morning session as there are for the afternoon session?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I frankly do not know, I would think that it would not make sense really to have the same number of staff really when there are less pupils but there may be conditions of service which require such provision. I can find out for him.

**HON S E LINARES:**

One other question which strikes is the dash in St Bernard's School in the afternoons, can the Minister explain why there are not any afternoon sessions in St Bernard's School nursery?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Because there is no demand, they do not get applications for St Bernard's in the afternoon. I think now that it has been mentioned that in St Bernard's there is not the same number of staff in the afternoon obviously because there are no children at all. I think they are deployed elsewhere.

**NO. 1187 OF 2005****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – BEST PROGRAMME**

Can Government state how many children are currently on the BEST Programme giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1187 of 2005****BEST Provision 2005/6**

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>NO. OF CHILDREN</b>
Governor' Meadow	15
Notre Dame	19
St Bernard's	13
St Joseph's	8
St Mary's	18
St Paul's	9
Hebrew Primary	8
Bishop Fitzgerald	12
Sacred Heart	21
St Anne's	20
St Joseph's	10
Bayside	23
Westside	12

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1187 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I see that the highest figure corresponds to Sacred Heart School, the question obviously would be is there any link between the pupils that actually attend Sacred Heart. On the cultural side there are lots of children from the town area which is the catchment area of Sacred Heart and therefore there are many children of other ethnic minorities, to put it in a nice political acceptable way, in that school and that they could well be causing behavioural problems because for example, language problems?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That could be a factor definitely. As is known in terms of education and behaviour so many factors come in including interestingly the language problem which breaks communication. Remember that the behaviour modification programmes and tuition and counselling is not just purely as we imagine it in terms of discipline and in terms of problems of causing trouble, it is also a positive enabling programme for children who have difficulty in settling down in the school ethos and in the school regime. It could be that because of the area which is provided for by Sacred Heart there is that demand there.

**NO. 1188 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MOD PUPILS**

Can Government state how many services pupils currently attend secondary school giving a breakdown by school and the amount that the MOD contribute to the Department of Education for the education of these pupils?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

As at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005, there were 15 pupils from MOD families in Bayside School and 19 at Westside School.

The cost per pupil is £1,226.39 per term or £3,679.17 per annum. I make a distinction there because sometimes they do not stay for the whole year so an adjustment is made. The MOD will therefore contribute on this basis £125,091.78 if all the pupils remain in school for the whole year. Should any leave during the year this figure will be adjusted accordingly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1188 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When I talk about Services children does that include children whose parents are in the Gibraltar Regiment?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, Gibraltar Regiment pupils are entitled pupils.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister then explain why there is a difference between pupils of the children of the Gibraltar Regiment and pupils who are from the RAF or HMS Rooke, why should there be a difference although I understand that they are entitled, not necessarily because they are Gibraltarians because there are many people in the Gibraltar Regiment who are not Gibraltarians they are UK citizens but they are still entitled. Can the Minister explain why this difference?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am not sure of the legal background to this. I think it is a question of residence perhaps, Gibraltar belongs, it may be connected to the question of status, of civil status, residential status but that is the way it has always been for many years and the MOD accept this at secondary level. They have their own school at primary level, but they have to pay the fees, that is the way it is.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It begs the question that it is to do also with the now new housing, the way that the Gibraltar Regiment is housed, this is why I am trying to see why the MOD should not pay for the education, even though they are Gibraltarians, they should not pay for the education of children whose parents are in the Gibraltar Regiment, I do not see why. The MOD should pay.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Thankfully housing is outside my remit as Minister, I have gone through difficult patches but not housing.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I was just giving the example, the analogy.

ORAL

**NO. 1189 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BAYSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state the number of pupils in year 10 in 2004/2005 academic year and 2005 to date in Bayside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1190 of 2005.

**NO. 1190 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – WESTSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state the number of pupils in year 10 in 2004/2005 academic year and 2005 to date in Westside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1190 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1189 and 1190**

School	2004/5 30 September 2004)	2005/6 (30 September 2005)
Bayside	218	206
Westside	191	203



**NO. 1191 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – 14 TO 19 EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Can Government state how many times the 14 to 19 Education Committee have met in the year 2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

Given that the co-education working group includes all members of the original 14-19 Working Group, it has been asked to extend its scope beyond the issue of co-education and consider all the other wider issues arising in the UK as a result of the 14-19 proposed reforms. As I shall explain in answer to Question No. 1202 which is about the co-education working group, the co-education working group with the new scope that I have now explained, in its agenda has met five times from January to June and once in October this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1191 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Then from two committees they have made one, basically that is what he is saying, and that is supposed to look at co-education as well. Can the Minister state whether they have discussed the Tomlinson Report and at what stage they are in relation to ringing out, because there is a huge turmoil in the UK and I understand that, nobody knows what is happening, Tomlinson states one thing Government want to go in another direction, all political may I add, which we need to steer away from despite us questioning these things. Can the Minister state what are the indications of the 14-19 education committee as in the direction that we should take, and should the Minister not be considering other jurisdictions, how they deal with the 14-19 education? The Channel Islands and Scotland come to mind, Ireland comes to mind, the whole Commonwealth basically. Could the 14-19 education committee then look at all these aspects of 14-19 education because of what I have just stated about in the UK?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well, certainly the experts, advisers, the technical people in the Department try to keep abreast of developments beyond the UK, as suggested the Channel Islands

and all that, but personally I would be hesitant to depart from the modelling that we have now with the UK system of education. This is not to say that we adopt things blindly because as we know, and the hon Member has referred to it, the whole question of 14-19 after the rejection by Government of the Tomlinson Report is shrouded in controversy and confusion and that has been a difficulty for the 14-19 working group, what to hang on to and how to anchor their recommendations so that their considerations in this vast arena of different ideas, different white papers coming before the Ministers. It is a difficult moment both in the UK and thereby for us but as regards looking beyond that into other jurisdictions my inclination here and now, I may after consideration or advice change my mind, is that I would not depart too far from the processes that are going on in the UK for obvious reasons. Even just simply out of tradition we have modelled ourselves on the National Curriculum, the pattern of education in UK and because we are very dependant, at least in terms of our examination systems and higher education on the UK. I think that is the best I can offer the hon Member here and now in terms of reflections and speculation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am happy that he is saying the UK but the UK have different jurisdictions and they do work differently. For example, Scotland has a completely different 14-19 education system and therefore it could be advisable, I am not trying to change his mind but it is a question of we have traditionally gone with England and Wales, the English and Welsh type of education system. There is nothing wrong as I see it that we go through and look at how Northern Ireland and Scotland do their own 14-19 education system. Why? Because it is based on the UK model anyway but they seem to have detached the politics of it all and that is what we should be doing and we obviously do here in Gibraltar and that is why I think it is very advisable for the Minister to look at the Scottish or Northern Irish system where politics in education, there is politics in education but a different type, it is not a party political issue.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well I thank the hon Member for the advice, I am not being sarcastic I am grateful for the advice, but I did start by saying that we look at everything. The advisers are experts, they are educators and their job is to really study education broadly. As the hon Member knows, even in the UK there are many public schools which are now adopting the continental curriculum, the International Baccalaureate so we look at everything. I was just saying, and I was saying very sort of speculatively, perhaps I should not have said UK perhaps I should have said England and Wales, I accept that but this is just for general discussion.

**NO. 1192 OF 2005****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – INCLUSION PROGRAMME**

Can Government state how many children are currently in the inclusion programme giving a breakdown by school and year?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1192 of 2005**

Children currently in the schools' inclusion programme

<b>Name of School</b>	<b>Reception</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>First Schools</b>						
Notre Dame	1	1	4	6		12
St Bernard's	0	2	0	0		2
St Joseph's	0	0	0	1		1
St Paul's	0	0	2	2		2
St Mary's	0	0	0	1		1
Gov. Meadow	0	0	0	2		2
	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Year 7</b>		
<b>Middle Schools</b>						
Bishop Fitzgerald	6	4	4	3		17
St Anne's	1	1	0	0		2
	<b>Year 8</b>	<b>Year 9</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 11</b>	<b>Year 12</b>	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>						
Bayside	2	4	1	4	1	12
Westside	2	3	2	1	0	8
	<b>Nursery</b>	<b>Unit 1</b>	<b>Unit 2</b>	<b>Unit 3</b>		
St Martin's Outreach	1	3	3	1		8
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>67</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1192 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister explain why there is no inclusion programme in St Joseph's Middle and Sacred Heart?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

In St Joseph's there is one pupil in Year 3, in Sacred Heart there is no child in the inclusion programme. Inclusion is determined by the assessment panel, as the hon Member will know, and it is a question of catchment and children who are deemed to require inclusion for a whole variety of reasons, which could be visual impairment, it could be autism or Downs Syndrome, may have not fallen within the catchment of Sacred Heart or St Joseph's. That is my thinking on that because they all go through the assessment panel and where they go for inclusion depends really on the catchment from which they come.

**NO. 1193 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EDUCATION – HERITAGE VALUES**

What does the active education programme designed to instil heritage values into school children actually consist of?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

I am frankly surprised at this Question coming from the Hon Dr Garcia who is closely associated with the Panorama, because that newspaper very consistently and ably and appreciatively reports on the extraordinary and on-going activities involving our school children in heritage projects. I am very grateful for that. Indeed, during the Tercentenary year I dare say that our schoolchildren were among the top protagonists in the wide programme of events which marked this historical occasion. It is not for nothing, as the hon Member knows and as was reported actually very fully in the newspaper, that Bayside School has been recently awarded by the Heritage Trust their top junior award for their magnificent “Walk Through History” Project which was acclaimed generally by the community as a whole. Really that is what we mean by active educational programmes – programmes of education in the field outside the ambit of the classroom. Of course, these activities are always underpinned by structured lessons on local history which is part of the curriculum of all schools’ history syllabus.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1193 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

First let me assure the Minister that my association with the Panorama is confined to reading it. Secondly, the question arose because of an article that appeared not in the Panorama but in the Gibraltar Chronicle, so actually the question is based on straight quotation from the speech by his Colleague the Minister for Heritage. This is more a heritage question than an education question. I know the Government select the Minister to answer the question but it was more intended from a heritage point of view, because what the Minister actually said in his address to the Heritage Trust, is ‘we, the Heritage Department, continue to liaise with schools as part of an active education programme. I would like to stress the importance of such programmes and the relevance of educating our children and instilling in them heritage values’. Now my question was aimed from a heritage point of view to see what exactly the

Minister meant when he said 'liasing with the schools' and how these heritage values are being instilled in our schoolchildren.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well I think I have answered that question really, how we go about it. I thought he would be quoting from somewhere, I am very glad he was not quoting from something I had said in a careless way because I would not use the word 'instil values', with respect to my Colleague, education is a *dūcere* which is to draw out and not to put in and what we do actually in terms of values opens up the minds and hearts of pupils to an awareness of these things, especially in terms of our heritage, all that goes with it in terms of pride in our community, pride in our achievements et cetera.

**NO. 1194 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BULLYING IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how many incidents of bullying were reported in schools in the 2004/2005 academic year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

We have answered this type of question before in good faith (Question No. 202 of 2005) but then we found that we fall into a trap really because it was later picked up by the media the figures that we gave in terms of the number of incidents of bullying and giving a totally wrong impression. The Question is a blanket question which does not distinguish between degrees of seriousness in incidents of bullying. What do we mean by “reported in schools”? – this can range from trivial incidents reported to teachers (“Miss, he is calling me names”) to serious parental complaints of incidents which exist, in which parents have to be called in which have some degree of substance. As I say, we cannot answer this question, as formulated in such a generic manner. However, I will give the hon Member some figures of what I have described as serious bullying incidents which cannot be tolerated, which the schools’ policy and the Department’s policy is zero tolerance. I can give some figures which have been provided in that context:

First Schools – two incidents. I am saying First Schools because again I have decided that it would not be appropriate to give a breakdown by individual schools. I think he will probably understand that that is rather invidious.

First Schools:	2
Middle Schools:	8
Secondary Schools:	12

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1194 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I can assure the Minister that I have not yet published any press release to do with bullying so it could not have come from information from Opposition Members, it probably was through Hansard itself, but may I say that I appreciate that he has given me a figure but I would ask that if the same criteria that he used for Question No. 202 of 2005 which he mentioned, the same criteria that he used then be given to

me now and I can understand what the Minister is saying by individual school, and I appreciate that he has given me first, middle and secondary sections but I would also appreciate, and I can say that it is on a confidential basis, I would like a breakdown per school if possible. Although like I said, the first, middle and secondary is in the public domain, let the media use it as they wish I am not controlling the media. What I am saying is that I would personally like a breakdown by school because it will be a great help in my analysis, that is why I pose all these questions, there are analyses behind all these questions. I then get all the data, put it in to a data bank, see the trends, up, down, whether a school is failing or not failing, in the case of bullying for example. Obviously I am not going to go publicly and say that school and that headteacher is failing in its bullying policy so I would appreciate if the Minister could forward that information, information of a breakdown by school, using the same criteria that he used in Question No. 202 of 2005 giving me a breakdown of all the schools' bullying. I would appreciate that.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

A number of points I have to make on that. First of all, let me make it clear I was not blaming the press, I want to make it clear that I was not blaming the press for creating the wrong impression, if anything I was blaming ourselves. Innocently, our headteachers gave us a whole range of figures for all incidents, from trivial to the very serious ones of bullying and that is what they published, the press picked it up because it was in the public domain. I was not blaming them. What I mean is that the wrong impression was given by the criteria that we used and I am certainly not going to follow that criteria. I think it is absolutely totally irrelevant to give out bullying incidents which take place in the playground, as I said, and one kid blames the other and that sort of thing. I think it does not tell us anything about the discipline ethos of the school but I do agree that the serious incidents, yes, I will consider giving the hon Member a breakdown by schools. I will tell him what are the two incidents of bullying in whatever First School they took place, I do not know frankly. Also I will give him a breakdown of the eight incidents of serious bullying in Middle Schools. I will consider actually telling him what schools were involved and similarly with the 12 incidents of bullying in Secondary Schools. The criteria is the main thing I want to avoid because I think that was a very blanket, vague, general type of criteria which as I say does not tell us anything about the situation of discipline in the schools. I hope he understands what I am getting at.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It is incredible because I posed this question with a different wording from the last one. I will say why, because in the last question I asked how many incidents of bullying were reported to headteachers, because I can understand that a child comes to a teacher in the classroom saying 'he is doing this to me or that to me' and that is reported, and this time round I actually wanted to find out how many they were. Like I said, I would still appreciate that I be given a breakdown of incidents by schools confidentially.



ORAL

NO. 1195 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION - GASA**

Can Government state how many times classes from schools used the GASA swimming pool during school hours in the last academic year giving a breakdown by school?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS

Answered together with Question No. 1196 of 2005.

**NO. 1196 OF 2005****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION - GASA**

Can Government state how much was paid or is owed by the Department of Education to GASA for the use of the swimming pool in the last academic year?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached. Let me point out also that no money is actually owed by Government in respect of the use of school children in the GASA swimming pool, we paid to the last penny for all the uses made and that sum paid out for the sessions that were held this year amount to £1,669.

**Answer to Question 1196 of 2005****Answer to Question 1195 and 1196**

Classes from Government schools used the GASA swimming pool for a total of 42 sessions during the 2004/5 academic year. These are broken down as follows:-

<b>School using GASA pool (2004/5)</b>	<b>Number of sessions</b>
Bayside School	22
Westside School	8
Bishop Fitzgerald School	12

Since September children from Sacred Heart are also using the pool this academic year.

No money is owed by Government in respect of the use of school children of the GASA swimming pool during the last academic year. The sum paid out for the sessions that were held amounts to £1669.

ORAL

**NO. 1197 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TEACHERS ON TEMPORARY CONTRACTS**

Can Government state how many teachers have been given temporary contracts for 1, 2, 3 years respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1198 of 2005.

**NO. 1198 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TEACHERS ON PERMANENT SUPPLY**

Can Government state how many teachers are on permanent supply basis in the last and current academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1197**

No temporary contracts have been as yet given to teachers for one, or two or three years respectively.

**Answer to Question No. 1198**

In 2004/2005, there were 12 teachers on long-term supply as opposed to occasional supply, and in 2005/2006 there were 17 teachers in this status.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1197 AND 1198 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In the last House we had a big debate about contracts, about supply and we were assured that the way to go forward is to give a contract, Government were waiting for Human Resources to draw out a contract, can the Minister now tell us when those contracts will be in place? I think it is about time and we went through why there is a difference between having a contract and being on a permanent supply. I think it is unfair for the people who are on permanent supply, for the reasons we have gone through already, trying to get themselves mortgages, trying to settle down, all these issues. Can the Minister then state when we are going to have contracts for one, two or three years for teachers at least?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The hon Member is right, we had a long debate on this last time and I can tell him that the assurances given by the Chief Minister then agreeing the fact that temporary contracts should be given to teachers on a long-term supply basis, covering for

maternities or covering for politicians, the assurances still stand. As to when I am afraid that Human Resources is working on this in finding the appropriate legally drafted contract, I am assured that this is in process, but I cannot tell him more than that.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I think something should be done soon because one cannot have 17 on a permanent supply basis. Seventeen teachers who have no condition of work basically, they miss a day, they get ill, they do not get paid, as simple as that. I think it is unacceptable that having had this debate, not only in the last House but two or three Houses before, we are talking about nearly two and a half years that this debate has been going on and still the Human Resources are still drafting out a contract, I am sorry but I cannot accept that. So can the Minister do something about having Human Resources work faster in order to put those contracts in place?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I can assure the hon Member that the Minister will do his best to speed this up. Certainly I am concerned and I want to speed up things.

**NO. 1199 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS**

Can Government state whether there has been any consultation with users in relation to the community use of schools in order for the facility to begin earlier now that schools finish at 3.15 and 3.30 pm?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

There has been no consultation with users in relation to the community use of schools in order for these facilities to begin earlier. The Department is quite clear about this together with consultation with headteachers, and we do not believe that we should make these facilities available earlier since it would not enable the schools to organise their own extra-curricular activities without at the same time clashing or interfering with the cleaning programme if it is brought forward before the start of community use. That is the policy adopted by the Department.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1199 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would like to state that the policy is nonsensical if that is the Department's policy because if cleaners have now got three quarters of an hour to clean before, that means we have the school available three quarters of an hour before we had it in the past. What I am saying is that there should be consultation with the Associations, with users of the community scheme and therefore the schools should be made available. Whether the Department has a policy or not that is up to them but what I am saying is that the users want that, and we had that debate last time again and the answer from the Minister was that there was no demand, that none of the users had come to the Department to say 'I want to use it three quarters of an hour before'. Well, if put that way I do not think anybody will come, what has to be done is make it available and that is why I think that the policy is nonsensical. It should be reviewed. Can the Minister then look at reviewing that policy please?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, I am not prepared to review it. I do not think my officers in the Education Department are liable to indulge in nonsensical policies, therefore, I am not prepared

to either overrule them or reconsider what they decide is the best practical way of managing the cleaning and the extra-curricular activities of schools.

ORAL

**NO. 1200 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURE**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in each school giving a breakdown by school in this financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

The hon Member asked how much has been spent, the total is £729,966.



**Answer to Question 1200 of 2005**

Expenditure incurred from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005 to date on maintenance in each school.

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Bayside	£255,856
Westside	£131,137
Gibraltar College	£19,005
St Joseph's Middle	£8,408
St Anne's Middle	£63,870
Sacred Heart Middle	£5,164
Bishop Fitzgerald	£113,325
Hebrew Primary	£662
St Martin's	£14,558
Notre Dame First	£15,081
St Paul's First	£51,739
St Mary's First	£15,076
Governor's Meadow	£9,092
St Bernard's First	£6,793
St Joseph's First	£7,419
Varyl Begg Nursery	£12,781

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1200 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state whether this is purely on maintenance or these are works which have been, for example, requested minor works as he is aware of, minor works which the headteacher says, 'I need a new extra room', which is not maintenance, it is a minor work. It means that it is something extra, because I am specifically asking about maintenance, things that are like a board falling down, a window that breaks, things like that.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It includes everything. It includes things like, for instance, the total painting of Bayside School which is still on-going, but it is from the same vote that we draw for incidental repairs and problems that arise on a day to day basis.

ORAL

**NO. 1201 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state whether there has been any progress in relation to the health and safety policy document for schools since this Question was last asked in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1202 of 2005.

**NO. 1202 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – REGISTER OF ASBESTOS**

Can Government state whether there have been any further inspections in order to draw up a register of asbestos in schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1201**

The Health and Safety Policy has gone through all the stages of consultation. The Department is currently assessing the financial implications for inclusion in next year's estimates of expenditure. The document will be distributed to schools at the start of next term.

**Answer to Question No. 1202**

There have been no further inspections in order to draw up a register of asbestos in schools.

**NO. 1203 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST BERNARD’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether there has been any progress on the relocation of St Bernard’s School since this Question was last asked in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

No decision has been taken on a possible relocation of St Bernard’s School as yet, but the matter forms an important part of the inter-ministerial discussions which are taking place currently in relation to the new uses of the old St Bernard’s hospital site. It is within that context that we are looking at the relocation of St Bernard’s School, having accepted the fact that it would probably be advisable to relocate St Bernard’s School from where it stands today.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1203 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister have an indication of when we will see a possible relocation?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, I cannot specify a particular date.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Out of interest, as an old boy of St Bernard’s School myself and the fact that there may now be a possibility that my alma mater may move, as a resident of the Upper Town, is it still going to be the case that the Upper Town will have its own first school?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Very definitely yes, I think the Upper Town deserves a worthy first school, we have a middle school in Sacred Heart, that is definitely on the mind of Government and on

my mind. Interestingly the history of St Bernard's School is a very interesting history actually my father used to go there, it used to be the Lourdes School in those days, 'la escuela de los pobres' it used to be called because the Christian Brothers had 'la escuela de los ricos' in Line Wall School paying and St Bernard's School was also run by the Christian Brothers. So it has a very interesting history and I say that because there is always an element of sentiment in actually departing from the educational thrust of schools but that is the way things are.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I cannot resist the temptation to join in the reminiscing, maybe my hon Colleague who has more experience than I does not seem to remember but the hon Member's alma mater was not always there, St Bernard's used to be, and it used to be my alma mater, by St Bernard's Hospital. St Bernard's used to be alongside St Bernard's Hospital in what is now a private dwelling, and we are going back to the mid 1950's.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In my days it was next to what St Bernard's Hospital had expanded to and we were always next door to the hospital, is there any indication of where the school may go or is that one of the issues that is being considered?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The indication is what I mentioned before, that we are looking, studying the global use of the site of the old St Bernard's Hospital and it is within that context that we are considering but no decision has been taken as yet as to the relocation of the school.

ORAL

**NO. 1204 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MATERNITY LEAVE FOR TEACHERS**

Can Government state whether there has been any progress in relation to the proposal submitted by the NASUWT (GTA) on maternity leave for teachers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1205 of 2005.

**NO. 1205 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – WORKLOAD AGREEMENT**

Can Government state whether they have officially been notified by the executive of the NASUWT(GTA) as to whether they have a mandate to negotiate the workload agreement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

These matters are now under negotiation between the Government and the NASUWT (GTA). Therefore, It is not thought to be appropriate to give information as to the progress in these negotiations while they are being carried out and the way that they are being handled.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1204 AND 1205 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When the Minister says that they are negotiating, does he mean both the maternity leave and the workload agreement?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, the hon Member is right, the workload agreement we have no notification from the NASUWT (GTA) that they have a mandate. Whether they have or not is of course not our business, it is their business, but what I mean is that this is a potential issue for negotiation. Obviously it will have to be negotiated, the workload agreement will have to be negotiated since it involves conditions of employment in the blue book and therefore we do not think it is appropriate to advance information or Government's thinking at this stage.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I posed the question on the workload agreement and I understand that has more implications than the agreement itself because it goes in conjunction with other things, but what I stated was that in October in the last House I asked the question on the workload agreement and the Minister stated, 'anyway the GTA has no



mandate to negotiate'. That is why I have posed the question again because I understand it that the GTA have not actually said to the Department they have no mandate, it has been taken for granted apparently by the Department that they have no mandate because there was a meeting and whatever. What I am saying is that despite the fact, and the question was posed in such a way, that I wanted to know whether the executive had actually written or had actually notified the Department about the mandate issue, because it seemed from the answer to the question the last time that they were not willing to look at the workload agreement because the GTA had no mandate to negotiate anyway. That is why I have posed the question. Therefore the question would be, is the Department going to start re-negotiating with the GTA the workload agreement, is it going to negotiate it with them?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not think I could have said, with respect, that we would not look at the workload agreement, we are looking at it all the time I assure the hon Member. We are very knowledgeable as to the implications in terms of conditions of employment and everything, and staffing as well which is one of the concerns I think of the Union that we have a very generous pupil/teacher ratio which in England they do not have, and that this would have implications in that respect. That the way out in many places in England is to employ unqualified learning assistants, as they are called, to be able to implement the workload agreement which is a reduction of chores for teachers and these chores are passed on to learning assistants which nevertheless, we know from practical experience, are taking on teaching duties and that is something that we have to be very careful about. I do not think I could have said that we are not looking at their workload agreement I think what we said is that at that stage, and certainly this is the stage at the moment, we have not been officially told by the GTA 'we now have a mandate from our members to get down to brass tacks and negotiate the workload agreement', that is the state of play at the moment.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When the Minister says that we have had no mandate it means that they do not have a mandate, double negative. I will explain it is very simple, he has just stated that the GTA have not gone to him and said 'now we have a mandate' but have they come to him saying 'we cannot negotiate because we have no mandate' this is the issue.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am not sure of that I think there have been informal phone calls and conversations saying 'we are still waiting for our members to give us a clear fully fledged mandate to be able to enter into a proper negotiating process'.

**HON S E LINARES:**

The last supplementary to these two questions is that on the maternity leave issue, the last time I think the debate went through and it was mentioned that they were looking into having 20 weeks rather than 26 weeks and they were studying also the proposals that the GTA had put forward. Can the Minister state what would be the completion date of these negotiations, because they already have had proposals

forwarded to them and counter-proposals and I think it is about time that there is a decision taken either way?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

If I went along giving that information I would be contradicting myself. I said before that these intricacies of the negotiating process are not appropriately discussed here until they are completed.

**NO. 1206 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TLR AND EXCELLENT TEACHER**

Can Government state if there has been any progress in negotiations with the NASUWT(GTA) in relation to the TLR and EXCELLENT Teacher since the last Question Time in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

At this moment, as yet, there has been no formal negotiation as such with the NASUWT on the issue raised in the question. The Department is currently undertaking a series of presentations to all teachers to inform them of the change from Management Allowances to Teaching and Learning Responsibility Payments. Since this requires a corresponding re-structuring of posts in all schools, the Department has launched a process of consultation with Headteachers and their staff. When the Department receives the views of Headteachers and their staff, it will be in a much clearer position to start negotiating with NASUWT (GTA) from that base.

The very interesting question of EXCELLENT Teacher formats, the EXCELLENT Teacher scheme is a new grade which commences actually in September 2006, next academic year, in England and Wales. The NASUWT (GTA) has not indicated whether they will actually be claiming for the introduction of such a grade. It could be, and a bit of speculation here, that grades such as, for example, the Advanced Skills Teachers grade (AST) have not been available in Gibraltar since the NASUWT felt that this was not necessary anyway and could in fact lead to divisiveness among teachers. As I say, that is an area of speculation. With regard to the main point about the TLR's, that will have to be re-structured into our schools, we have not reached the point yet of formal negotiations.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1206 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Why is it that the Government are consulting and doing presentations to Headteachers and with staff when the Headteachers and their staff are represented by the NASUWT (GTA), all of them including the Headteachers? Why are there formal negotiations not through the Association?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Let us be clear about this, one thing is information, dissemination of information and consultation and another thing is the formal negotiated process between Government and the Union. The stage at the moment is one of consultation, information, making sure that all teachers (including by the way in those presentations the members of the NASUWT as teachers have been present) that we all know what they are talking about, we all know what the state of play is, what the implications are and I think it is on side, it is not for me to speak for the Union but I think the Union should welcome this type of dissemination of information so that when they eventually make formal claims and get down to the negotiating table, there is some sort of a consensus of conceptual issues rather than just simply pure negotiation in the dark.

**NO. 1207 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – EQUALISATION OF POSTS**

Can Government state at what stage they are, in relation to the equalisation of posts within schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The wide consultation which is actually as I have just explained being undertaken by the Department, involving all teachers in every school, should, we think and hope, ensure that the new structures will meet the needs of schools appropriately and adequately. One has to remember that the last time schools, their posts and structures were actually carried out was in 1988, I know because I was involved at the time as Headmaster and I have to say that the teachers at that time were not consulted and this is certainly not going to be the case now.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1207 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In 1988 it was to do with the National Curriculum and all the scaling changing from the old to the new scale which was the 'A' Allowance, 'B' Allowance system which I remember myself being involved. Therefore I was doing this work because it was the whole term of national curriculum coming in and all the big turmoil which now, another restructure as big as that one and probably even bigger, so that is why I have posed the question because I am happy to listen to the Minister say that he is linking the three issues in a way, which is workload, TLRs and EXCELLENT Teachers and equalisation of posts. Therefore it is the teaching profession now, because as I said before I do not think politics should get involved in this one, because it is to do with the whole restructure of the Education system and how we do it we need to get it right because if we do not get it right the ones who are going to suffer are our children. Therefore it is essential that we get it right and I am glad that the Minister has linked the equalisation of posts with the other two issues.

**NO. 1208 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CLASSROOM AIDES**

Can Government state how many classroom aides are on a permanent supply basis giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1208 of 2005**

<b>Name</b>	<b>No. of Classroom Aides</b>
Notre Dame First School	4
St Bernard's First School	2
St Joseph's First School	2
St Paul's First School	1
Varyl Begg Nursery	1
Bishop Fitzgerald School	4
Westside School	1
St Martin's School	2
St Mary's First School	1

**NO. 1209 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CO-EDUCATION**

Can Government state whether a co-education working group has been set up as promised by the Minister in answer to Question No. 2286 of 2004 and if so how many times has it met since its inception and who are its members?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, CIVIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

I can confirm that a working group was set up in January this year to carry out a feasibility study of co-education at secondary level. The working group has met five times from January to June and once more in October this year as I had occasion to explain in answer to Question No. 1191. It has actually produced an interim report setting out different options to be considered by Government. The members of the working group are the following:

Chairman:	Director of Education & Training
Alternate Chairman:	Mr J J Alcantara, previous Director of Education
Members:	Mrs E Pinna, Retired Deputy Headteacher President, NASUWT (GTA)
Headteachers:	Westside, Bayside, St Anne's, St Paul's; Principal, Gibraltar College; Senior Education Adviser; 3 Education Advisers.

**NO. 1210 OF 2005****THE HON L A RANDALL****ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in October and November 2005, providing a breakdown of the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1210/2005****Record of Power Cuts – 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005 to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Districts Affected</b>	<b>Cause</b>
1	Wednesday 5 <sup>th</sup> October 2005 20.02hrs	7 mins to 1 hour 29 mins	Eight districts supplied from WPS. 10,11,12,13,14, 15,17,18 Four districts supplied from OBDC. 1,7,9,21	Fault in S49 Substation at Europort. Switchgear circuit panel to S72 Safeway Substation flashed over.

The districts fed from Waterport Power Station comprises parts of Queensway, Line Wall Road, Casemates, Marina Bay, Glacis Road, Waterport, North Mole and the whole of the Westside reclamation area.

The districts fed from Orange Bastion Distribution Centre comprises Laguna, Bayside, British Lines Area, Devil's Tower, Catalan Bay, Sandy Bay, Town Area, Moorish Castle area and parts of Queensway.



ORAL

**NO. 1211 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO**

Can Government state the number of units and the value of electricity purchased from OESCO in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1212 to 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1212 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units and the value of electricity purchased from MOD in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211 and 1213 to 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1213 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state the number of T3 (Domestic Consumers) units of electricity invoiced to customers in the periods April to September 2004 and 2005, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211, 1212 and 1214 to 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1214 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state the number of units of T3 (Domestic) units of electricity invoiced to customers in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211 to 1213 and 1215 to 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1215 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state the number of customers invoiced in respect of T3 (Domestic) units of electricity in October and November 2005 and for the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211 to 1214 and 1216 to 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1216 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state the total value invoiced to customers in respect of T3 (Domestic) units of electricity in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211 to 1215 and 1217 to 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1217 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – FUEL COST ADJUSTMENT**

Can Government state the total value invoiced to Domestic Customers in respect of Fuel Cost Adjustment (FCA) in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211 to 1216, 1218 and 1219 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1218 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – STANDING CHARGES**

Can Government state the total value invoiced to Domestic Customers in respect of Electricity Standing Charges in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1211 to 1217 and 1219 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1219 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state what were the amounts collected and the amount billed in respect of electricity in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedule.

### **Answer to Question 1219/2005**

#### **Answer to Question 1211/2005**

Purchases from OESCO Ltd.

<b>2005</b>	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
Units (kwh)	6,990,310	7,092,270
Value	£881,642.92	£823,885.09

#### **Answer to Question 1212/2005**

Purchases from the MOD.

<b>2005</b>	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
Units (kwh)	281,687	309,069
Value	£29,140.80	£31,876.21

#### **Answer to Question 1213/2005**

Units billed to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers – period April to September 2004 and 2005.

	<b>April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>
<b>2004</b>	4,739,472	3,913,458	3,689,525	3,598,180	3,632,997	3,602,868
<b>2005</b>	4,450,595	3,904,212	3,616,896	3,535,749	3,521,128	3,892,278

#### **Answer to Question 1214/2005**

Units billed to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers in October and November 2004 and 2005.

	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
<b>2004</b>	3,572,308	4,192,574
<b>2005</b>	3,721,939	3,949,655

#### **Answer to Question 1215/2005**

Number of Consumers billed (invoiced) under T 3 Domestic Tariff in October and November 2004 and 2005.

	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
<b>2004</b>	12,619	12,626
<b>2005</b>	12,571	12,591

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1219/2005**

**Answer to Question 1216/2005**

Amounts billed (invoiced to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers in October and November 2004 and 2005.

	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
<b>2004</b>	£357,944	£415,704
<b>2005</b>	£447,531	£471,024

**Answer to Question 1217/2005**

FCA billed (invoiced) to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers.

	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
<b>2004</b>	£100,364	£117,799
<b>2005</b>	£121,335	£128,761

**Answer to Question 1218/2005**

Standing Charges billed (invoiced) to Tariff 3 Domestic Consumers.

	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
<b>2004</b>	£25,380	£25,388
<b>2005</b>	£50,772	£49,988

**Answer to Question 1219/2005**

Amounts billed to all consumers under all tariffs.

	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>
<b>2004</b>	£969,756	£1,003,736
<b>2005</b>	£1,253,976	£1,237,011

**NO. 1220 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state the reason for the high level of amounts billed in electricity to all consumers under all tariffs in the month of September 2004, which was provided as £3,349,812 in answer to Question 611 of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

In September 2004 two large bills were issued in respect of two consumers. One was for the sum of £2,313,553.33 to Kruger Engineering (who were the original operators of the Incinerator at Europa Advance Road), and the other for the sum of £63,363.53 to the Rock Hotel.

ORAL

**NO. 1221 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – AMOUNTS BILLED**

Can Government state the number of customers that were invoiced for Domestic Primary Units of water during the period April to September 2005 and April to September 2004, providing a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1222 to 1228 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1222 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state the number of units of Domestic Primary Units of water invoiced during the period October and November 2005 and for the equivalent months in 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

Answered together with Question Nos. 1221 and 1223 to 1228 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1223 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state the value of domestic primary units of water invoiced in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1221, 1222 and 1224 to 1228 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1224 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state the number of units of Domestic Secondary Units of water invoiced in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1221 to 1223 and 1225 to 1228 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1225 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state the value of Domestic Secondary Units of water invoiced in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1221 to 1224 and 1226 to 1228 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1226 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state the number of customers that were invoiced for Domestic Secondary Units of water in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1221 to 1225, 1227 and 1228 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1227 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state the values in respect of Water Standing Charges invoiced to Domestic Customers in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

Answered together with Question Nos. 1221 to 1226 and 1228 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1228 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**WATER - CHARGES**

Can Government state what were the amounts collected and the amounts billed in respect of water in October and November 2005 and in the equivalent months in 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1228/2005**

**Answer to Question 1221**

<b>Months</b>	<b>April'04</b>	<b>May'04</b>	<b>June'04</b>	<b>July'04</b>	<b>Aug'04</b>	<b>Sept'04</b>	<b>Oct'04</b>	<b>Nov'04</b>
No. of consumers of Domestic Primary Units	11719	11718	11704	11729	11731	11729	11719	11719

<b>Months</b>	<b>April'05</b>	<b>May'05</b>	<b>June'05</b>	<b>July'05</b>	<b>Aug'05</b>	<b>Sept'05</b>	<b>Oct'05</b>	<b>Nov'05</b>
No. of consumers of Domestic Primary Units	11693	11694	11699	11698	11697	11686	11688	11669

**Answer to Question 1222**

	<b>October '04</b>	<b>November '04</b>
Potable water billed by Units Domestic (Primary)	382940	389964
	<b>October '05</b>	<b>October '05</b>
Potable water billed by Units Domestic (Primary)	382018	375511

**Answer to Question 1223**

	<b>October '04</b>	<b>November '04</b>
Potable water billed (Primary Units) by value	£63,945	£70,464
	<b>October '05</b>	<b>October '05</b>
Potable water billed (Primary Units) by value	£81,677	£79,362

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1228/2005**

**Answer to Question 1224**

	<b>October '04</b>	<b>November '04</b>
Potable water billed by Units Domestic (Secondary Units)	223615	246223
	<b>October '05</b>	<b>November '05</b>
Potable water billed by Units Domestic (Secondary Units)	208669	188109

**Answer to Question 1225**

	<b>October '04</b>	<b>November '04</b>
Potable water billed by Value Domestic (Secondary)	£100,627	£110,800
	<b>October '05</b>	<b>November '05</b>
Potable water billed by Value Domestic (Secondary)	£108,508	£97,816

**Answer to Question 1226**

	<b>October '04</b>	<b>November '04</b>
No. of Consumers of Domestic Secondary Units	5557	5822
	<b>October '05</b>	<b>November '05</b>
No. of Consumers of Domestic Secondary Units	5449	5330

**Answer to Question 1227**

	<b>October '04</b>	<b>November '04</b>
Standing Charges (Domestic)	£17,654	£17,679
	<b>October '05</b>	<b>November '05</b>
Standing Charges (Domestic)	£35,498	£35,751

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1228/2005**

**Answer to Question 1228**

	<b>2004</b>	
<b>Period</b>	<b>Amount Billed</b>	<b>Total Collections</b>
October '04	£375,297.30	£389,876.42
November '04	£358,123.83	£320,114.82

	<b>2005</b>	
<b>Period</b>	<b>Amount Billed</b>	<b>Total Collections</b>
October '05	£361,062.17	£505,222.19
November '05	£362,001.47	£379,286.25

**NO. 1229 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government state what was the staff level of Gibtelecom at the time that the Voluntary Separation package was offered to 32 employees and how many of these 32 employees have taken up the offer by the closing date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

On a number of occasions previously, and when the hon Member himself was a member of the senior management team of Gibtelecom, the Government made it clear that the Company no longer considered it appropriate in a liberalised market for the Government to provide commercial information on Gibtelecom to which they have access as one of the Shareholders. The hon Member should therefore approach the Company directly and it would be for them to decide what information on staffing they are prepared to release into the public domain at this time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1229 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The Minister is right in saying that both as General Manager of Gibtelecom and indeed as Shadow Minister for Telecommunications I believe that I should not ask questions related to commercial matters. However, I feel that perhaps it is going a bit over the top providing an answer to this question being classified as commercially sensitive, but if that is the way the Minister wants it fine, I will write to the company.

**HON F VINET:**

I beg to differ with the hon Member the staffing levels are connected to the commercial aspects of the company.



ORAL

**NO. 1230 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**INCE'S HALL**

Can Government say how much has been spent giving a breakdown on the refurbishment of the Ince's Hall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 1231 of 2005.

**NO. 1231 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**INCE'S HALL**

Can Government state what provisions have been made in the Ince's Hall refurbishment for disabled persons to access the Hall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

A total of £49,609.85 has been spent to date, broken down as follows:-

Carpets and Curtains	-	£ 3,902.90
New seats	-	£13,492.86
Air Conditioning	-	£18,519.18
Refurbishment of toilets, staircase & lobby	-	£12,567.31
Mirrors, displays and posters	-	£ 1,127.60

I am informed that the Ince's Hall building poses particular technical problems, but we are nonetheless looking at what can be done in the next phase of the refurbishment programme so that disabled persons may have access to the hall.

**NO. 1232 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE - EXCHANGES**

Can Government state whether any youth exchanges have been organised this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Gibraltar Youth Service in partnership with Bracknell Youth Service in UK and as part of the Active Citizenship programme in Gibraltar organised one Youth Exchange trip in Bracknell, UK in 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1232 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state what was the last one before this one?

**HON F VINET:**

No, I would require notice of that question.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Did the Government get any EU funding for this Youth Exchange?

**HON F VINET:**

My understanding is that no EU funding was provided.

ORAL

**NO. 1233 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state whether the qualifications obtained from the Youth Leaders course are accepted in the UK and/or the EU as a valid accreditation to conduct Youth work abroad?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 1234 of 2005.

**NO. 1234 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state how many trainees have completed this year's Youth Leaders course and how many of those that completed are currently working within the Youth Service on a voluntary or professional capacity?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

This year eight persons undertook the part-time youth leaders course completed in July 2005. Three of these persons successfully completed and all are now working for the Gibraltar Youth Service as part-time youth leaders.

The part-time youth leaders course being delivered does not lead to valid accreditation from the UK or the EU to conduct youth work abroad. At present there are no courses available that provide such validation and/or accreditation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1233 AND 1234 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When the Minister says there are no courses does he mean locally or generally?

**HON F VINET:**

I mean generally and certainly in the UK. The course being delivered follows that of the UK training practices developed in conjunction with the British Forces Youth Service. As I say, they use a similar course which is also not yet fully accredited or validated by the British Forces Youth Service itself.

ORAL

**NO. 1235 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE ACTION COMMITTEE**

How often and on what dates has the Heritage Action Committee met since 21 September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 1236 of 2005.

**NO. 1236 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE ACTION COMMITTEE**

What is the composition of the Heritage Action Committee as on 30 November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Heritage Action Committee has met on two occasions, 21<sup>st</sup> September and 23<sup>rd</sup> November.

The composition of HAC is as follows:-

The Hon Fabian Vinet	-	Chairman
Professor Clive Finlayson MBE	-	Secretary
Cdr J L Ballantine OBE, RD, RNR (Retd.)		
Mr Dennis Beiso		
Mr Joe Desoisa		
Mr David Eveson		
Dr Darren Fa		
Mrs Geraldine Finlayson		
Mr Richard Garcia MBE		
Mr Paul Naughton-Rumbo		
Mr Paul Origo		
Mr Carl Viagas		
Ms Claire Valarino	-	Minutes Secretary

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1235 AND 1236 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is this the committee where heritage concerns are discussed between the Heritage Trust and the other organisations and the Government?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, it is in fact a forum that allows the Heritage Trust to raise whichever grievances or issues they have directly with Government.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the issue of Rosia Tanks has been discussed in this committee?

**HON F VINET:**

The agendas are fairly lengthy, there are usually 14, 15, 20 different items on the agenda. The particular issue of Rosia has been raised as I recall once but not to any great extent.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has the issue been raised at the meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> November, which is the only meeting that has taken place after the application for planning permission in relation to the Rosia Tanks development, can the Minister say whether the issue was raised and discussed in that particular meeting?

**HON F VINET:**

I cannot recall in all sincerity whether it was at that one or the 21<sup>st</sup> September one. In any case, it was a very generic discussion so that is the information I have available. I would have to check the minutes of the meetings in order to ascertain whether it was that one or the previous meeting.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister says that it was generic, was it in relation to the proposed development at the Rosia Tanks for which planning permission was being sought or not?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, the proposed development was referred to.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was it the view of the Gibraltar Heritage Trust that that development should not be located in that particular site?

**HON F VINET:**

I think that question ought to be posed directly to the Heritage Trust and it is not for me to put in their words what they may or may not have said.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the view of the Government that the Rosia Tanks site has heritage value?

**HON F VINET:**

The question aims to elicit from me an opinion rather than facts and I would not like to comment any further.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The question simply seeks to elicit whether the Government consider that an area which was built in the 18<sup>th</sup> century to supply what was essentially Gibraltar's naval base at that particular time, whether Government consider whether that area has heritage value or not. That is really a factual question.

**HON F VINET:**

There have been no discussions as to the particular heritage value or otherwise of the Rosia Tanks area itself. It is fair to say that Gibraltar is full of areas which have heritage value to a lesser or greater extent, as was the case for example of the Gas Works where the Vineyards Estate was built.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The construction of the Vineyards Estate in the Gas Works by the AACR is hardly a comparison with the 18<sup>th</sup> century supply area for the Napoleonic naval base, which is essentially what that area was. Can I ask the Minister whether he shares the view of the Gibraltar Heritage Trust that having this development overshadowing Parson's Lodge and the Victualling Yard would spoil the area and undermine our efforts to be considered as UNESCO World Heritage Site?

**HON F VINET:**

No, I do not share that view.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the view of the Government then that the Rosia Tanks area will not be spoiled by the construction of the building, will not overshadow Parson's Lodge and it will not affect the heritage of what remains of Rosia Bay and will also not affect our bid to be considered as a UNESCO World Heritage Site?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, that is the view of Government.

ORAL

**NO. 1237 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE – VICTUALLING YARD**

On what terms was the lease of the Victualling Yard given to the Gibraltar Heritage Trust and on what date did this happen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 1238 of 2005.

**NO. 1238 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE – VICTUALLING YARD**

What is the duration of the unexpired portion of the lease of the Victualling Yard which the Gibraltar Heritage Trust is being asked to surrender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

A 20 year lease with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> March 1996 was granted to the Trustees of the Friends of the Victualling Yard Charitable Trust on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 1996, the consideration being the costs incurred in general works of improvement, restoration and preservation of the yard and the rent of one peppercorn per annum.

The residue of the term of the lease is 10 years 3 months. The lease will expire on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2016.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1237 AND 1238 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister why the Heritage Trust are being asked to surrender the lease?

**HON F VINET:**

No, I have not been privy to negotiations between Government and the Trust.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Minister know whether there are any plans for the development of that particular area?

**HON F VINET:**

No, there are no plans for this area that I can reveal today.

**NO. 1239 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE – WORLD HERITAGE STATUS**

Can Government list the heritage assets which have been listed by the Heritage Division for inclusion in a possible bid for World Heritage Status?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

It is premature to reveal a list of properties prior to consideration and discussion by the Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1239 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The existence of the list was actually revealed by the Minister himself in his address to the Annual General Meeting of the Heritage Trust, is it that there are actually no items on the list at present and the list is still being drawn up, or has it not got to that stage yet?

**HON F VINET:**

The matter is still being considered at length by the Heritage Division, there have been no formal proposals put to Government at this stage.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to clarify, the proposals put to Government are made by the Heritage Division which is part of the Government?

**HON F VINET:**

The proposals are put by the Heritage Division to the political Government.

**NO. 1240 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE – CASTLE GATEHOUSE**

Who will carry out the trial excavation soundings at the Castle Gatehouse starting this month and with what objective?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The soundings will be conducted out by Mr Francisco Giles Pacheco, archaeologist with great experience in the field and a person who has been involved in archaeological works on the Rock since 1994. The work will be supervised and monitored by the Director of the Gibraltar Museum and his staff.

The objective falls within the broad strategy of research into the medieval and late medieval urban heritage of the first city of Gibraltar. The Gatehouse has been the subject of vandalism over the years and the Heritage Division took steps to secure the site two years ago. The site presents a unique opportunity to understand the archaeology of the medieval castle of Gibraltar and will give insights into possible future work in the wider castle site once the prison is moved to its new location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1240 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the archaeologist who is carrying out this work selected by the Government or who does the actual selection?

**HON F VINET:**

The archaeologist is selected by the Heritage Division with whom this gentleman has a professional relationship dating back to 1994.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister how long the works are expected to take?

**HON F VINET:**

I would not like to hazard a guess, I have not been provided with that information.

**NO. 1241 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CULTURE – NEW YEAR’S EVE AND MISS GIBRALTAR 2006**

How many tenders have been received for:

- (a) the organisation, production and staging of the New Year’s Eve celebrations at Casemates Square; and
- (b) the organisation, production and staging of the Miss Gibraltar 2006 beauty contest;

who was the successful tenderer and what was the sum bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

With regard to the New Year’s Eve celebrations I have just been informed this morning that there have been three tenders received. The successful tenderer was Word of Mouth concert promoters and the sum being £34,819.96.

As far as the Miss Gibraltar 2006 beauty contest is concerned, this is still under consideration and I will inform the hon Member once the decision is made.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1241 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to say how many tenderers there were for that or not?

**HON F VINET:**

I am not aware of the number of tenderers. I would also add, for the sake of clarity, if I recall prior to the deadline I think there were three but I am uncertain as to whether there was a late tenderer or not.

**NO. 1242 OF 2005****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****HERITAGE – HEAD 102 SUBHEAD 11**

How much of the £100,000 estimated expenditure for the financial year 2005/2006 shown as Head 102 Sub-Head 11 Heritage Projects has been spent as at 30 November 2005, with a breakdown showing the project, the amount and who the money was paid to?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1242/2005**

<b><u>PROJECTS</u></b>	<b><u>AMOUNT</u></b>	<b><u>PAID TO</u></b>
Gibraltar Caves Project	£2825.00	Carlos
	£5321.00	A & M Scaffolding
	£42.00	Angora Ltd
	£18.00	GTR Technical Systems
	£337.32	Hire-U-Shop
	£4680.00	Subsistence for Excavation Personnel
	£3870.00	Emile Youth Hostel (Accommodation)
	£1170.00	The Retreat House Trust (Accommodation)
	£9862.66	IZASA S.A. (equipment)
	£1216.73	Customs (duty on equipment)
St Michael's Cave Painting Restoration	£2447.50	Eudald Guillamet
Museum Air Conditioning	£16514.00	Cold Aire Engineering

**Total                      £48304.21**



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1242 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The first item on the schedule, the way I read this, relates to Gibraltar Caves Project, amount £2,825 and it was paid to Carlos, who is that?

**HON F VINET:**

Carlos is the trading name of a shop in Main Street. I would assume that is the case otherwise there would be a surname attached to the forename.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Continuing the Minister's assumption, this must have been for equipment to use in the cave I suppose?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, this is all for technical electronic equipment, specialised equipment dealing with the archaeological work at the caves.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The largest sum in relation to that project is nearly £10,000 that was paid to IZASA S.A. which is a Spanish company, what equipment does that relate to and on what equipment was that amount used to buy?

**HON F VINET:**

All the equipment listed under Gibraltar Caves Project is technical, scientific equipment to do with the archaeological excavation works there. I do not know what the exact equipment is, I have no difficulty in providing the hon Member with a more detailed breakdown. At this stage I do not know what the particular equipment is.

ORAL

**NO. 1243 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported and the value of fares collected from these passengers by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited in October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The passengers carried were as follows:

October 2005	127,241, an increase of 37 per cent over October 2004
November 2005	110,069, an increase of 12 per cent over November 2004

The value of fares was:

October 2005	£80,332
November 2005	£69,174

ORAL

**NO. 1244 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government provide an update on the status of the dispute regarding Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The dispute has been satisfactorily resolved.

ORAL

**NO. 1245 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYED GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the months of October to November 2005 receiving:

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;

no payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1246 and 1247 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1246 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government provide in respect of each month of this year the breakdown by industry and nationality of the vacancies filled?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1245 and 1247 of 2005.

**NO. 1247 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – RESIDENCE PERMITS**

Can Government state as at 30<sup>th</sup> November how many non-EU males aged 65 and over and females aged 60 and over are registered as seeking employment and have been given Residence Permits to continue in Gibraltar for this purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The statistics that have been requested are produced on a quarterly basis. Therefore the information sought will be available during the course of January 2006.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1245 TO 1247 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister must be aware that in fact when it has been given in the House, although the totals are the same as is published the breakdown that has been provided is in fact more detailed than that that is published in the summary of the press releases that are produced quarterly. Is he saying that he can provide it after the end of the year in that format?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

What I am trying to say is that once the figures for this quarter, which will obviously be covering the period October/November/December, will be available in January I can make that information available to him, the details that he requests. Now he can either subsequently ask another question in this House or we can have an undertaking that I send him the information in writing, whatever he prefers.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of Question No. 1247 of 2005, that is not something that is going to be published in January I figure?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, that is why I say I am happy to answer a subsequent question in the House or I am able to write to him with the information when that becomes available.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can he say how many non-EU nationals were seeking employment at a date other than 30<sup>th</sup> November, does he have a figure at all?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I do not have any figures available here but I can actually give him the information in writing if he so wishes after the quarterly information has been compiled, and this can be done as at 30<sup>th</sup> October/November but it is done on a quarterly basis.

ORAL

**NO. 1248 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CREMATORIUM**

Can Government say who has conducted the EIA into the Crematorium project and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1249 to 1251 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1249 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say whether the Environmental Impact Assessment into the Eastside project has now been completed and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1248, 1250 and 1251 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1250 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**

Can Government say whether Environmental Impact Assessments will be required for the projects by OEM at North Gorge, Buena Vista, Cumberland Road and Rosia Tanks?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1248, 1249 and 1251 of 2005.

**NO. 1251 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government list all the grounds contained in the Screening Opinion submitted by the Town Planner which led him to recommend that there should be an Environmental Impact Assessment into the Mid-Town project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The decision in respect of the Mid-Town Project was that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required. This was stated in answer to Question No. 829 of 2005. The advice and opinions of officials to Ministers and to the Development and Planning Commission is confidential and will not be provided in answer to questions in this House.

No EIA has yet been carried out in respect of the Crematorium project.

The EIA in respect of the Eastside project has not yet been completed.

At the date that answers to the questions were prepared, no application for planning permission had been received in respect of the Buena Vista and North Gorge projects. In consequence, the issue of whether or not there is a need for an Environmental Impact Assessment does not arise.

The Town Planner has determined that there is no requirement for an EIA in respect of the Rosia Tanks and the Cumberland Road applications.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1248 TO 1251 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that when we discussed the Environmental Impact Assessment issue into the Mid-Town Project, the Government freely explained that although the Town Planner had given an opinion in favour of such an environmental impact assessment it was the view of the DPC as a whole that it did not carry enough weight or they were not going to go along with it and it is only as a result of that there is no environmental impact assessment, not because the Town Planner did not recommend it. Again, this information already came out in the House at the last meeting, why is it confidential today?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I think I need to explain to the hon Member what the procedure is. The Town Planner on any form of application, especially on major projects, carries out his own assessment as to whether there should be or not an environmental impact assessment. Then on the strength of that he prepares a scoping opinion which is basically an opinion as to whether an EIA should be conducted or not. Then it is up to the Minister statutorily to decide whether this EIA or not goes ahead. I take the view that it is sometimes too much of a responsibility in a sense of taking a view as to whether to allow the EIA to be conducted or not, and therefore I practice the idea of putting it to members of the Development and Planning Commission as to whether what they feel and I get feedback from them before I make my own decision. On this particular matter a scoping report was produced because obviously this is a major project, and it was put to me for consideration and I felt that even though I had my own views on the matter that the members of the Development and Planning Commission ought to have the opportunity to be briefed on the matter and express a view. Based on that I took my own view on the matter and in this particular case, the scoping report was put to the Development and Planning Commission and they took the view that there was no need for an environmental impact assessment to be conducted and therefore, an environmental impact assessment was not conducted after my own decision was taken.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was it the case nonetheless that in the scoping report produced by the Town Planner as his own opinion and anything else the Minister has explained, that report actually recommended there should be an EIA taking place? That is what we discussed last time and I understood the Minister had confirmed.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Let me say that these scoping reports do not actually say yes or nay, normally it is a view and basically the Town Planner, obviously with his experience and knowledge, puts across a set of views to both sides so that a balance and accurate assessment can be taken by somebody like myself who has no experience or expertise in this particular area. I sometimes do discuss these verbally with him in order to gauge what he feels but I do not think that the Government have taken the view, scoping opinions are not really for the public because it would open up a lot of debate on issues as to whether or not an environmental impact assessment ought to take place or not.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case then that the Town Planner did not actually say that there should not be an EIA into this particular development either?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, absolutely. The scoping report does not actually go and say, 'you must have a scoping report, you must have an EIA'. There are times when he is very convinced of that and there is no area of doubt, in which case I would not even take it to the

Development and Planning Commission, I would take the decision myself, like for example in the Eastside Project, but if there is a wide range of issues which basically do not give a categorical opinion one way or the other, then I normally take the view of taking it to the Commission for the Commission to have their own view and express those views to me as well.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I accept that that is what the Minister said in his previous answer but it is not the answer he gave at the beginning that the impression was that it was actually the Town Planner himself had also recommended there should not be an EIA into the project. The fact is that he did not recommend that there should be or that there should not be, that is the position as I have understood it given his last answer. That is not what he said at the beginning.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I need to clarify, again for those who may not have understood clearly, the scoping report, scoping opinion prepared by the Town Planner does not actually in some cases give a definitive recommendation one way or the other, and that is left for the Minister with responsibility for Planning to actually decide on whether an environmental impact assessment ought to be done or not. In this case, whenever there is doubt in my mind as to whether there should be one or not, the Development and Planning Commission is consulted in order for me to have a wider range of views expressed and not just the opinion of the Town Planner himself.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There were a number of questions taken together so I will be referring to some of the others now. The answer the Minister gave in relation to the environmental impact assessment into the Eastside Project, although it is not yet completed, can the Minister say whether a target date has been set for its completion, is this completion imminent or what is the situation?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The completion was due to have been done some time in November, in other words last month. This date was extended until mid-February and again there is a possibility of some slippage there as a result of the fact that some of the surveys that are being conducted as part of the EIA have taken longer to present to the main body of consultants that are undertaking the EIA on behalf of the developer. We are hopeful that the slippage may be a month or two after February next year.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Previously we have discussed in this House the question of the Spanish request for participation in the environmental impact assessments or the environmental effects of the Eastside Project, is that something which has happened at this stage or will happen at a later stage? Is the Minister in a position to shed some light on this question?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

When an EIA is conducted a wide cross-section of representative bodies, associations and anybody who feels are in some way affected by this are consulted, and I know that there has already been consultation with a number of parties in this respect. I think there are still more parties to be consulted and allow input into this scheme.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister says that parties have been consulted and more will be consulted, does he mean parties in Gibraltar or parties in Spain?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The consultation is being done with local entities and nowhere else.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1250 of 2005, which was requesting information as to whether an EIA was needed on the projects at North Gorge, Buena Vista, Cumberland Road and Rosia Tanks, the Minister replied that the North Gorge and Buena Vista projects had not formally applied for planning permission at this stage. In the other two cases the information was that an environmental impact assessment did not arise into Rosia Tanks or Cumberland Terraces. Can the Minister say whether any other type of assessment, for example a heritage assessment is something which would be done in this particular instance or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, in respect of Buena Vista and North Gorge, as I have already said, that would be considered by the Town Planner when an outline application is made by the developers. In respect of Rosia Tanks and the ex-Cumberland building site, that has had the benefit of the Town Planner carrying out an assessment and he has determined that there is no need for an environmental impact assessment to be undertaken by the developers. As far as consultation on heritage matters, these are issues that are discussed by the Development and Planning Commission because the Gibraltar Heritage Trust is represented there so their views are taken on board.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I do not think the views of the Heritage Trust are taken on board in relation to the Rosia Tanks project. The Minister has just said that the Town Planner himself has determined that there should not be environmental impact assessments into the Rosia Tanks or Cumberland Terraces. Did he not say in answer to previous questions that this went up to the Minister and the Minister would then take a decision, because there was a statutory responsibility as to whether there should be an EIA or whether there should not, and that the Town Planner had made no recommendations simply stating the pros and the cons of the project?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, if the Town Planner feels that there is no pros and cons, in other words, that there should not be an environmental impact assessment, he does not even notify me as Minister whether there should be an environmental impact assessment. He just raises the issue with me of an environmental impact assessment if he feels that there are issues that ought to be considered for a possible EIA but not otherwise.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We seem to be getting two different answers to the same question from the Minister. Just before the last supplementary from my Colleague he said, 'the Town Planner has determined there should not be an EIA in this case'. Now is it that he has determined that there should not be or is it that he is unsure whether there should be or should not be and has therefore put to the Minister the arguments for and against. Which of the two is it? He seems to be telling us both things in answer to the same question.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not think that is correct. In respect of the Rosia Tanks and Cumberland application, the Town Planner has determined that there should not be an EIA because he does not feel that there are any issues that give rise for him to even give consideration to an EIA. Now if he had thought that there would have been issues of concern that would have been for consideration for an EIA, he would have issued a scoping report where he would have raised some of the issues that were of concern to him and would have given me a balancing situation as to pros and cons in respect of the scheme. Then I would have taken the view as to whether his recommendation was something that was valid or something that I wanted further input from the Development and Planning Commission. I hope that clarifies what the procedure is because there is only one procedure and I hope I am not confusing the issue.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore, in the case of Rosia Tanks the situation is that it has not gone to the Planning Commission at all.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, well a scoping opinion is done internally but it has not been submitted to me for consideration because he does not feel that there are issues that require an environmental impact assessment.

ORAL

**NO. 1252 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 1 September 2005 and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1305 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1253 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Can Government list the applications for planning permission in respect of projects that have been granted and rejected since the last meeting of the Development and Planning Commission on 1 September 2005 showing those that are still under consideration, including the name of the applicant and of the project in question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

## Answer to Question 1253

Application Type	Site Address	Decision	Name
Formal building application	Old Naval Hospital Site Naval Hospital Road	Approved	Hopefield Properties
Formal building application	2 Victualling Office Lane	Approved	M E Bellio & Partners
Demolition building application	Chatham Counterguard	Pending	Government Project (C Viagas)
Demolition building application	Sir Herbert Miles Road Both Worlds	Approved	ABCO International Limited
Minor Works building application	Minor works building application	Approved	Bay Management Limited
Outline planning application	Queensway Quay	Pending	Andrew Kent & Stone (AKS)
Outline planning application	5 Hargrave's Parade	Pending	AKS
Outline planning application	60B Sunrise Motel Devil's Tower Road	Refused	AKS
Formal building application	19 Flat Bastion Road	Pending	W Gomez
Formal building application	129/131 Main Street	Approved	Green Clover Holdings
Demolition building application	Ex MOT Centre North Mole Road	Approved	M E Bellio & Partners
Minor works building application	83 Rosia Dale	Approved	D & T Conroy
Formal building application	58/1 Engineer Lane	Approved	Lawrence Stagnetto
Formal building application	Ex Crag Bottling Plant North Mole Rd	Pending	AKS
Minor works building application	1 Fish Market Road	Pending	L Stagnetto Limited
Minor works building application	Casemates Square	Pending	Cool Blues Limited
Minor works building application	18/19 Lathbury Barracks Industrial Park	Pending	Messrs Minimarkets
Minor works building application	5/6 International Commercial Centre	Pending	Space Projects
Minor works building application	28/30 Medview Terrace Catalan Bay	Pending	Mr Diego Mena
Minor works building application	1 South Barrack Mews	Pending	AKS
Minor works building application	Second Floor Regal House	Approved	Party Gaming, 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, Bldg 7 Europort
Minor works building application	The Tower Marina Bay	Pending	Ibex Insurance Neptune House
Formal building application	Caleta Hotel Sir Herbert Miles Road	Pending	AKS
Formal building application	Gala International Casino Europa Road	Pending	Gala Group Limited
Minor works building application	8 Transport Lane	Pending	M L Romero
Formal building application	Second Floor Regal House	Approved	Bay Management Limited
Minor works building application	309 Main Street	Pending	Risso Limited
Minor works building application	Glacis Road	Pending	PCG Group Overseas Limited
Formal building application	14/7 South Barracks Ramp	Pending	M Chipolina & Ms Trico
Formal building application	9 Willis's Road	Pending	Natalie Montegriffo
Demolition building application	Victualling Yard	Pending	GJBS Limited
Minor works building application	306 Devil's Tower Rd Wellington Court	Approved	Drusilla Caballero
Formal building application	1/5 Imossi House 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Irish Town	Approved	Timbercove
Demolition building application	2 Buena Vista Road	Pending	AKS
Minor works building application	Leanse Place Town Range	Approved	Victor Chandler
Minor works building application	221/222 Mauretania Both Worlds	Approved	Mr L Rigby
Outline planning application	Rosia Water Tanks Rosia Road	Pending	OEM Rosia Developments Limited
Minor works building application	Hambro House Line Wall Road	Pending	Space Projects
Outline planning permission	Ex Cumberland Building Cumberland Rd	Pending	OEM Cumberland Developments
Demolition building application	Old Substation Sir Herbert Miles Road	Pending	The Gibraltar Government
Formal building application	215B Marks & Spencer Main Street	Pending	M E Bellio & Partners
Outline planning application	Europort Avenue	Pending	Jehovah's Christian Witnesses
Minor works building application	15D-1 Baudelaire House Town Range	Pending	Mike Clarke
Minor works building application	12/1 Buena Vista Barracks	Pending	AKS
Minor works building application	126/128 Main Street	Pending	Mr S Mahtani
Minor works building application	Europort	Pending	Europort Int. Holdings Limited
Minor works building application	6/8 Library Street	Pending	Broadbay Co Limited
Minor works building application	6a Gardiner's Road	Pending	Dr Ron Coram
Minor works building application	Victualling Yard	Pending	GJBS
Outline planning application	1/3A Bedlam Court	Pending	Sharrock Shand Holdings Limited
Minor works building application	30 Parliament Lane	Pending	Messrs Paradiso Limited
Minor works building application	Suite 801 Europort	Approved	WSRM Architects
Minor works building application	56/58 Irish Town	Pending	Pizzaghetti Factory
Formal building application	47 Europa Road	Pending	Manuel Peralta
Formal building application	19A Halifax Road	Pending	J B Engineering Consultants

Contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1253**

Application Type	Site Address	Decision	Name
Formal building application	55 Flat Bastion Road	Pending	J B Engineering Consultants
Minor works building application	101 Wellington Court	Approved	Mr & Mrs P C Graham
Minor works building application	15 Line Wall Road	Pending	Arthur Ferrary
Minor works building application	Unit 7 & 8 Ocean Heights	Pending	R Shukla
Minor works building application	604 Wellington Court	Approved	Erika Wainwright
Minor works building application	94/96 Irish Town	Approved	M Cabedo
Minor works building application	158 Main Street	Pending	H D Mahtani
Formal building application	19-37 Castle Ramp	Pending	Carl Viagas
Formal building application	1 Parody's Passage 19/21 Castle Ramp	Pending	Mr & Mrs Carl Viagas
Minor works building application	2 Blackwood Tower Brympton	Pending	Mr & Mrs Jones
Minor works building application	12 Town Range	Pending	Mr Richard Almeida
Minor works building application	Leanse Place Town Range	Pending	Victor Chandler Worldwide
Minor works building application	503 Both Worlds	Pending	Mr Chris Homewood
Formal building application	14 John Mackintosh Square	Pending	WSRM Architects
Minor works building application	3 Mayfair Close Montagu Crescent	Pending	William Gomez
Minor works building application	2 Hamilton Court Harbour Views	Pending	Mr & Mrs D C Segovia
Formal building application	33 Naval Hospital Road Admiral's Place	Pending	AKS
Minor works building application	King's Wharf Queensway	Pending	King's Wharf Limited
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>73</b>

ORAL

**NO. 1254 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ELIOTT HOTEL**

Has planning permission been granted to the Elliott Hotel to construct a multi-storey annexe and if so have any changes been requested to the project from the plans that were originally submitted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1255 to 1259 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1255 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LOQUAT HOUSE**

Can Government say whether the Development and Planning Commission has now granted planning permission or rejected the application for the construction of a swimming pool at Loquat House, South Pavilion and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1254 and 1256 to 1259 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1256 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PLANNING PERMISSION TO OVP LTD**

Further to Question 840 of 2005, has the application for planning permission made by OVP Ltd now been granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1254, 1255 and 1257 to 1259 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1257 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CREMATORIUM**

Has planning permission now been granted to the Crematorium project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1254 to 1256, 1258 and 1259 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1258 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CLINICAL WASTE INCINERATOR**

Has planning permission now been granted to the Clinical Waste Incinerator project and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1254 to 1257 and 1259 of 2005.



**NO. 1259 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PLANNING PERMISSION TO OEM LTD**

Has planning permission been granted to OEM in respect of the following projects and if so when:

- (a) North Gorge;
- (b) Buena Vista;
- (c) Rosia Tanks
- (d) Cumberland Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

At the time of preparation of the replies to these questions, planning permission had not yet been granted to the Clinical Waste Incinerator and Crematorium project, the multi-storey annex to the Elliott Hotel, Ocean Village Properties Limited, Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road, even though obviously it is now common knowledge that Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road have been given outline planning permission.

Planning permission to construct a swimming pool at Loquat House was granted on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

No application for planning permission has been received in respect of North Gorge and Buena Vista.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1254 TO 1259 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1259 of 2005, which raises the planning permission issues in relation to OEM, the two that have been granted out of the four sites are Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road. The Minister is on record as having said that the decision was made by majority, can he give the figures in relation to that majority?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, that is not possible, the voting of the members of the Development and Planning Commission is confidential to the members there and cannot be made public.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say how many members sit on the Development and Planning Commission?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe that there are nine voting members, although there are some members that sit and do not have a vote and mainly are officials from the Planning Department who actually sit at the meetings but they do not have a vote. Nine vote.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Out of the nine people who sit on the Development and Planning Commission who are voting members of it, how many of those are Government Ministers or Government Officials?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There are two Ministers on the Development and Planning Commission, there are three officials and there is a member of the MOD, there is a member of GONHS, a member of the Heritage Trust and I would not know whether to classify the Managing Director of LPS as a Government Official or not because it is a Government Agency.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So in effect when the Minister spoke of majority the two Government Ministers and the three officials alone already would allow for a Government majority anyway without taking into account the Managing Director of the Government agency. The question relates to the planning permission awarded to OEM in respect of this site, I have a question in relation to the actual company to which the Government have awarded without tender these two sites at Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road. My question relates to the shareholding of the company itself, it is public information that OEM International Limited has 1,000 shares, 500 of which are owned by Prime Nominees Limited and the other 500 by Prime Securities Limited, are the Government aware who the beneficial owners of these shares actually are?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The beneficial owner I think has been made public. The beneficial owner is Mr Robert Noonan who is a major property developer with interest in the UK, Ireland and Spain, I believe in America as well, and OEM International I would not know whether one would legally say is part of but it is definitely associated with OEM plc which is a plc company in the UK. Now whether the strictly legal relationship is one of being an

associate or being a parent company or otherwise I would not be able to say, but definitely it is Mr Robert Noonan who is the beneficial owner.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The reason for the question obviously is that they are considerable sites, they are four sites in all but I have questions in relation to two of them and the actual information of the company does not show who these shareholders are. Are there any local interests involved or is this purely entirely shares held by Robert Noonan insofar as the Government are aware?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Not that the Government are aware of, the Government believe that the shares are held by Robert Noonan in its totality.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The position at present in relation to the projects which OEM is responsible for is that two have been granted planning permission and two are awaiting the application for planning permission, the ones for North Gorge and Buena Vista. Given that North Gorge and Buena Vista were actually the two sites that were put out to tender and that Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road were added to the tender afterwards, can the Government explain, it is obviously a peculiar position because they have actually applied for planning permission for the ones which they did not tender for and which were not part of the original contract, can the Government explain what would happen in the situation where the developer pursues the last two and not the first two? In other words, the ones that they were not awarded a tender for and not the ones that they were.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the hon Member has made a statement which is incorrect. The tender went out for North Gorge and Buena Vista with one of the conditions being that the North Gorge was for affordable housing in order to be able to ensure that at least part of that land was available for affordable housing. The tender was submitted and in that submission OEM decided that they would bid a financial consideration for those two pieces of land and in addition to that said that they had recently acquired one of the sites themselves, that is the Cumberland Building, for a sum and therefore belonged to them and they asked that in order to meet the economies of scale in the affordable housing and in order to meet certain targets of pricing as far as affordable housing is concerned, they asked the Government whether the Government would be able to make available to them an additional piece of land in order for them to build at least 200 of these affordable housing units, and this was part of their tender submission. Now, the Government could have turned round and decided to go another way and accept another of the bids that was on the tender table for consideration but the Government decided on the merits of the scheme and the merits of the financial consideration, but most important on the merits of the fact that we were going to be able to develop 900 affordable housing units, the Government went down the route of identifying the Rosia Tanks as that possible site that was up for development. This was not a site that the developers had earmarked as part of their tender, they

submitted a tender where they had actually bid for any land, we could have given them land anywhere, to be able to build 200 affordable housing and we in turn decided that that would be a site that was suitable for that particular purpose.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I do not think that anything in my original intervention is inaccurate. The Minister has confirmed that the inclusion of Cumberland Road was part of the tender submission made by the applicant but it certainly was not part of the tender process or the tender conditions, and it was certainly not something which was advertised in the two official notices and which was mentioned in the Government press releases that were issued even after the tender award. It was only much later on in the process that we found out that Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road were to be included in this development at all. Certainly, for the Minister to stand up in this House and confirm that Rosia Tanks was identified by the Government themselves and not by the developer does not say much for the Government in terms of their often professed concerns for Gibraltar's heritage. My original question was, is the developer in a position to proceed with Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road, for which they already have planning permission, without North Gorge and Buena Vista which was the original tender that they submitted or was advertised?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There are premiums that have been paid and are to be paid to start with which if they did not proceed with the site the Government would have obtained a premium and I do not think they would have been short of developers to develop the North Gorge and Buena Vista, judging by the interest at the time of the tender and some of the bids that were submitted. Therefore, the Government are not going to find themselves in a difficult situation by the fact that the developers may decide to develop one site and not the other. The whole process, as one can well imagine, is a major series of developments that need time and therefore they have decided to start on what they feel are the easier. The Cumberland Building site and the Rosia Tanks is a flat site, it does not need a lot of surveying and studies that need to go into it as for example North Gorge and Buena Vista, but in the agreement that we have with OEM there is a detailed programme of dates by which these things must happen and so far everything has been complied with in terms of the master agreement.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the Government got the tender proposals from OEM in which they put forward the idea of doing 200 more housing units provided land other than the one that they had bid for was included, did the Government think of re-opening the bids on the basis of seeing what other people could do? Presumably from the answer we have had the only one who came up with this idea was OEM, other people just limited themselves, all these competing bids they told us and the level of interest was exclusively for North Gorge and Buena Vista I take it? If so, do the Government think that it might be in their interests to find out what would be the response from other people if they were given an opportunity of doing more houses on a different site, which need not have been as we now know Rosia Tanks because that was not something that the developer wanted?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government gave consideration to what the hon Member is saying but the difference between the bids that had been submitted by OEM and others was such a huge gap that it would not have served the purpose. We are talking of a number of millions of pounds between the highest bidder and the second bidder. In fact, OEM had actually bid money for the site itself, the additional site, it was not that they asked for a free piece of land. The site was for a fixed price for the Buena Vista and North Gorge and then offered a £1 million premium for one site and another £1 million premium for the site that they owned for the right of being able to develop. So therefore the difference on the financial aspect was so huge that there was no way that re-tendering would have opened up the possibility of financial benefits to the Government at all.

ORAL

**NO. 1260 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government say whether the construction of the tower and residential blocks of the Mid-Town project had the support of the Gibraltar Heritage Trust and GONHS?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1261 of 2005.

**NO. 1261 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MID-TOWN PROJECT**

What were the conclusions of the aeronautical study carried out by Halcrow Group Ltd into the Mid-Town project at the request of the RAF?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

In answer to Question No. 829 of 2005, I stated that the aeronautical study in connection with the Mid-Town project was commissioned by the developer at the request of the RAF and not the Government. I further stated that Government's interest is simply in the result of the study, namely that there should not be any negative impact on Gibraltar's airport arising from the development. The Government have been informed that the Halcrow aeronautical study has not found any negative impact on Gibraltar's airport arising from the development.

It is not Government policy to state how individual members of the Development and Planning Commission vote in relation to matters coming before the Commission.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1262 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PLANNING PERMISSION TO OEM LTD**

How many objections were received by the DPC in relation to the application for planning permission by:

- (a) OEM Cumberland Developments Ltd at Cumberland Road;
- (b) OEM Rosia Developments Ltd at Rosia Tanks?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1312 and 1313 of 2005.



**NO. 1263 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Can Government say whether the recommendations to the draft Gibraltar Development Plan made by Land Use Consultants of Bristol have now been considered both by the Government and the Development and Planning Commission?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1263 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government in a position to say when those recommendations will be considered?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The Government and the Development and Planning Commission are not going to be considering the recommendations made by Land Use Consultants, they do not have any role or any representation to be made to them. I think that the line of questioning makes me feel that the hon Member does not really understand why this Land Use Consultants of Bristol have been commissioned to actually carry an EIA on the draft development plan. This is something that we as a Planning Department have decided to conduct in order to ensure that whatever is in the Development Plan actually conforms to aspects that do not contravene any environmental, negative impact and so therefore it is just a safety net for the draft Development Plan and not for the Government or DPC to actually give any consideration to.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My line of questioning and my level of understanding reflects what the Minister has been saying in this House. That is why the question has been tabled, as a follow-up to the previous question which he answered without difficulty. Can the Minister then

say when this plan is expected to be in place, given that we run the risk that whatever environmental dangers there may be with the developments that are happening, that the developments will all be in place by the time the Plan has been enacted?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Before I answer the question I would just like to clarify that what is being considered by the Government and then the Development and Planning Commission is actually the draft Development Plan before it goes out to public participation, not the actual draft or the Land Use Consultant's environmental report on the Development Plan. That is part and parcel of the exercise that the Town Planning Department is doing in the preparation of this Development Plan and does not form part of the actual documentation.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I understand that. Is it not the case that the Town Planning Department is part of the Government, it is not a separate entity?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

If the Town Planning Department, in the context of the question, yes, obviously the Town Planning Department has considered the draft land development consultant report all through the process. As far as the Development Plan is concerned, that is currently with the Government giving it consideration and will be going to DPC for consideration very shortly and then public participation. Once the public participation have finished and the Government have decided to incorporate or not the recommendations made under this, then Land Use Consultants of Bristol will then be re-assessing the final version of the report in order to ensure that it is environmentally compliant.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister telling us in sum total of all the questions we have heard in answers so far and the last one that all the objections in respect of the proposed developments at Rosia Tanks et cetera, all the objections received by the DPC were dealt with by the Commission by way of proposing amendments to the scheme which the objectors then accepted dealt with their objections, or were they otherwise withdrawn, is that what he is telling us? In the answers that the Minister gave earlier he said that there was no way of differentiating between objections and a number of objections had been received which were identical. Is he telling us that the Commission took on board those objections and amended the scheme in a manner which was in keeping with those objections so that the objectors then said, 'we are satisfied our objections do not stand', or that the objections have otherwise been withdrawn and that therefore the DPC went ahead and granted permissions without those objections?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the objections have not been withdrawn. I never said that the objections had been withdrawn, what I did say I think was that the objections are taken on board and

the Commission decide whether to allow a scheme to go forward, be it as presented or amended, once it has given consideration to the objections that are put in place. It does not mean that the objections are taken on board and then the scheme is subsequently amended. It could be that the objections that have been submitted are not taken on board and that will be known when the outline planning permission is actually, although we may accept the scheme, the scheme sometimes are approved with amendments. I know the Government made a statement to the effect that they had reached agreement with the developers in order to alter the scheme, that has not been given any consideration by the Development and Planning Commission because there is no such amendment before the Commission for consideration. We have considered the application on the merits of what is before us which is the original application. I hope that clarifies.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, I appreciate that but was notice of that meeting given to all of the objectors, was 14 days notice of the meeting of the DPC given to all of the objectors whose objection stood?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well I assume that the Town Planner has done so, I cannot confirm. This is an administrative procedure which I am sure that the Town Planner, I know that the Town Planner replies or at least acknowledges all the objections that are submitted before any planning application, and I assume he carries out the requirements if what the hon Member says is something that is statutory and needs to be followed. I have not got a copy of the Ordinance here in front of me and I assume that if he does have a statutory obligation he would have followed that procedure in the same way as he follows all others.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The whole point is this, the legislation actually provides that individuals are entitled to attend and be heard, is that not the way that we can determine who it is that appears before the Commission and who does not? If it is 400, 4,000 or any more.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think that he will probably find that the same Ordinance does say that the Commission has the ability to determine whether it hears or does not hear any particular, or does it not?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What is very clear from the Ordinance is that the Commission shall consider written statements of the objectors and the objectors should be given not less than 14 days notice and the objector or his authorised representative may attend such a meeting, and if he desires shall be heard.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I take the point that the hon Member says but I would probably like to get some legal advice, he is a lawyer and I am not. I assume that the practice has been for the Commission not to give consideration to objectors to be making representations. I assume that that is something that has been done according to the law now for some time but I would like to make sure that is the case and probably later on in the Session will be able to clarify the matter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate the Minister's candour. Can I ask him now that the project appears no longer to be going ahead as a 10 storey development but as an eight storey development, will there be a need for the DPC to consider the amended project that the developer and the Government as landlord will be putting before it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the outline planning will be issued as per the original application because DPC had actually accepted a 10 storey building. What will actually happen is that the developer, who now have a commitment with the Government to amend its project, will actually be submitting a full planning application and therefore, at that stage, they will have the opportunity to make the relevant amendment. There is no need for it to go through the outline planning again.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case I will just leave it on the basis that the Minister will come back in relation to the issue I have just pointed out.

-----

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would just like to clarify a point that was made this morning by the Hon Fabian Picardo in respect of the ability of objectors to be able to make representations to the Development and Planning Commission and then have a right to be heard personally and not just restrict themselves to making a written representation. I have now had the matter looked into and I am advised that the section of the law which the hon Member was referring to this morning refers to Part 3 of the Town Planning Ordinance, which refers to planning schemes. Planning schemes means any plan or plans prepared from the direction of the Commission under section 5, and includes any written statement or explanation forming part thereof, and therefore does not refer to a planning application like we were discussing this morning which is subjected to Part 4 of building control under the same Town Planning Ordinance. If he refers to section 22 of that particular section of the law, under section 22(3) it says, 'in determining any application for planning permission for development of a part to which section 19 applies, the Commission shall take into account any written representation for or against the grant of a permit relating to that application which are received by them before the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the date of the application or the advertisement, whichever is the latter'. Therefore I do not think that there is any doubt on the Government side of the House that objectors

have any right to be able to make representations to the Commission in person as had been alluded to by the hon Member this morning. I presume that due to the fact that at a moment's impulse he jumped to get the law and he probably read into the wrong section, therefore I hope that he will be able to clarify the matter from his perspective.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for the Minister having looked at that particular section. As I told him when I made the interjection the set of Ordinances that is on the Opposition side is not updated and I referred to the set which the House have and that is updated very quickly in order to be able to deal with the point that was being raised. He is right to say that the section that I pointed him to deals with planning schemes and not with applications for planning permission before the Planning Commission. Those, he rightly says, are to be dealt with under section 22 and there is there no right for individuals to be heard as there would be in relation to planning schemes. I am very grateful for him having pointed that out. This brings me in particular to section 22 which is the section that deals with, as he has told us, the way that these applications should be dealt with. What that says is that the Commission, at section 22(1), in dealing with an application for planning permission shall be guided by the provisions of the approved planning scheme then current, and by any other material considerations, one of them obviously is the right to object in sub-section (3). Will the Minister not accept that there is no planning scheme to which there could have been objections or any public input in respect of that part of Gibraltar, and that that is one of the problems that this particular project we were dealing with will be labouring under, that people have not had the right to make representations as to what should happen in that area for the planning scheme. In this House, on a number of occasions, he has been pressed by my hon Colleague in respect of when there is going to be a new City Plan for Gibraltar, which would be one of those planning schemes.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The last Development Plan, which is the one that we all have to abide by, actually confirms that the development of residential houses is possible and therefore there is no issue as to what the Development Plan says or should say.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That of course would be a perfectly acceptable explanation if it were not that the conditions of tender for the site opposite in exactly the same area, which is the Anchorage Development, actually says 'the redevelopment should focus on the premise that the area is over-developed as a residential area and under-developed as a local and tourist asset'. On what possible basis can the Minister then tell us that adding a ten or eight storey building there is in keeping with the Planning Scheme?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is in keeping with the Planning Scheme. Governments can change their minds and that original tender I think included the Victualling Yard as a redevelopment site, which we then withdrew from that tender and then gave out

again. But the tender from which he is just reading envisaged the development of the Victualling Yard, I do not remember I may be wrong, I think it was a hotel and also the Rosia Bay. The things that were put out with the Anchorage site were the Victualling Yard land site so to speak, now controversially in question, and also proposals were invited for the old Swimming Club, the old Rosia Swimming Club. So that tender envisaged the development of that site. Now the issue that the Minister was addressing was whether or not there was in law a right for objectors to be heard at an oral hearing of the DPC. I think we can all more or less agree that that is not the case. Everything else that he has said is just revisiting the issues. Now I do not know what view the hon Members have when their only public statements in relation to these schemes relate to the fact that the site was not included in the original tender. I do not think the hon Members have expressed any criticism of the erection of that site there. In fact I think they have been careful not to do so. Whether the hon Member's submission signals that or whether he is simply saying 'Government have obviously changed their minds', in which case fine, Governments can change their minds.

ORAL

**NO. 1264 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

When do Government expect the surveys currently being carried out in connection with the Eastside Project to be completed so that it will be possible to establish what will be the marine depth and the maximum distance from the present shoreline that will be reclaimed when the area of land is extended?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1265 of 2005.

**NO. 1265 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government clarify whether the 6 year time limit on the granting of a lease for the Eastside development will apply to the completion of the whole scheme or the completion of the land reclamation part of the scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The surveys in question are not being carried out by the Government but by the developer. The Government nevertheless hope that the surveys will be completed by the spring of 2006.

The six year time limit on the granting of the lease applies to the completion of the "required scheme", which includes the Marina, the hotel, 500 apartments, the boutique cruise liner terminal, the cruise liner berth, the Eastern Beach car park and the temporary Catalan Bay car park.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1264 AND 1265 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Question Nos. 1015, 1016 and 1017 in the previous meeting of the House, my Question No. 1017 was whether there is a time limit within which the additional reclamation in the Eastside development has to be completed, and I was given the answer of six years, that is why I am seeking clarification now. Is there a limit under six years within which the actual reclamation part has to be completed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, but it is obvious the reclamation will have to take part before all of what I have just listed happens. So all this has to happen before the six years are up and the reclamation does not have a limit, it is within the six year limit, but within the six year limit all this has to be done as well.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Government were unable to give me answers in the last House to the maximum additional land area and the maximum depth at which land will be reclaimed. In fact the original question was the depth and the extension of the shoreline which they were permitted, and the reply I got was that the Government were not able to say that until the survey results come in. So in fact, given that we now know that the survey results are likely to be in mid-2006, what happens then? The Government then change the terms of the agreement to specify the permitted depth and the permitted extension or how do they do that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the actual master agreement actually defines an area out into the sea and the land itself which basically is the site area, within which all this project has to be contained. What we do not know is whether they are going to go right up to the borderline of that site line or whether it is actually going to go further in depending on some of the surveys that are being conducted, some of them have already been done, some of them are still to be done, which will determine the actual positioning mainly of the arm, what they call the protection arm of the site.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But then the answers that I was given in the last House are not correct, because I did not ask whether the developer was going to decide to go up to the limit or not, I asked what the limit was. My question in the last House was, can the Government say what was the maximum additional land area that the developer is permitted to reclaim and what is the maximum depth at which the maximum permitted reclaimed area will take place? The answer I got to that was that that was not known until the survey, but in fact the Minister is saying that it is no because the survey will only determine whether the developer feels that commercially it is a viable proposition to go to that limit or to do it within that limit falling short of it. That the limit itself is not dependent on the result of the survey then.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think when the master plan was actually drawn up and done we needed to identify an area, both on land and on sea, under which the scheme would have to be developed. The surveys will determine whether not just commercially but the viability of being able from an engineering point of view as well of how the site is going to be laid out. I think at that point we will be able to define as to where the boundary lines are going to be. There may be need for alterations depending on what the surveys show and what the commercially viable project will be. I understand what the hon Member is trying to say but strictly speaking I do not think until the surveys are finished we will be able to actually determine what the length of reclamation and the depth under which the project is going to be confined to.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am seeking information and either the information is available and may have to be altered as a result of the survey or the information does not exist until after the

survey. The last time I was told that the Government did not have a figure, am I right in thinking that the Minister is saying there is a figure but is not set in tablets of stone and that figure may be altered? If that is the case then the figure that we were asking for in Question Nos. 1015 and 1016 of 2005 obviously is the figure at that point in time, not the figure that may emerge following the survey since the Minister is in no position to tell me what the survey will produce.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I think the survey will become the actual location of the reclamation and the actual depth of the sea. There is in the master agreement an outline or a site line of the sort of area that we are talking about but subject to determination once the survey has been conducted and discussions with Government to determine the site. So strictly speaking both answers are correct but I can let him have the information on the site available of the master agreement but it is just there purely for the sake of actually determining the sort of area that we are talking about but it will not determine or show what the reclamation area will be or what the angle of the arm will be, or the depth under which the project will be constructed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then in fact there is a third answer which is that there is no maximum permitted distance or maximum permitted depth specified by the Government.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

What the master agreement does actually specify is a line around the site which will be where the project will be constructed. If there is a need to reconsider that, that will be subject for discussion with the developer but there is an outline or a tentative line around the site which will show where the project will be encompassed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I go back to the question I asked previously the answer to which was that the Government were not in a position to provide the information because that would be determined by the survey. I am trying to get a very specific answer to a very specific question, is there somewhere in the agreement between the Government and the developer a line that says the maximum depth at which one is permitted by this concession to reclaim land from the sea is a depth of x metres, does that exist?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The answer is no.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it does not exist, and will it exist once the survey is completed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, absolutely.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then in fact the answer is that there will have to be negotiation then subsequent to the survey saying to what extent they are permitted by the Government, as a result of the concession that has been granted to them, to go out away from the existing shoreline and at what depth that will be. Presumably that is something that will be binding on the developer and that the Government can do something about if those conditions specifically spelt out are not adhered to.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, in the master agreement there is, as I have said, a line around the development site which identifies the site and the area under which the project must be contained. However, if the surveys show that there is a need for further expansion then obviously consideration and discussion will need to be entered in order to agree to that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister know the depth at which that line that exists is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not have the information here. Yes, I am sure it could be worked out on the depth but the line is actually based on distance from the land.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept that but presumably where that distance happens to be there is a depth underneath.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the extent of the land, because my questions originally and my questions today are all the time talking about land area as opposed to an arm within which there is water and a marina, is there a limit to the total amount of land in this outline and will that be also subject to change as a result of the survey? If there is a limit.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the principal scheme has already been agreed but the actual configuration of the outline of the land will be needed to be considered once all the surveys have been concluded. The arm could change, the angle of the arm could change and all that has implications further inland.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that the Government are able to provide an answer to the question that I put in the last House which is, what is the maximum additional land area in square metres that the developer is permitted to reclaim? Is that information that can be provided or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, what I can provide is details of the line under which the site is defined but not the maximum length and distance from what he is asking there because that is subject to assessment once the study has been concluded.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But either the study is to see if what is in the original concept needs to be altered and changed and extended or reduced, or the original concept does not contain any restriction at all as to the level of land other than this imaginary line drawn on top of the water. If the agreement is silent on how much land can be reclaimed from the sea then theoretically it is possible for the developer to reclaim as much land as he wants within that line, is that the position?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, absolutely. The developer will be able to develop as much as he wants within that imaginary line. However, in that same agreement there is a detailed concept description of the scheme which identifies areas which will be land, marinas et cetera, so therefore there is a limitation to how much, the changing of that concept will require negotiation with the Government obviously.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not trying to get the Minister to provide me with something that is impossible, which is what would happen if those negotiations took place. I am trying to get a very specific piece of information which is how much land, as the thing stands now, irrespective of what may happen in future that may change it, how much land other than the 60,000 square metres that are already there within that imaginary line are they permitted by the present concept to reclaim? Are we talking about another 60,000 square metres, another 100,000 square metres or what?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I can let him have that information it does exist.

ORAL

NO. 1266 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB - UKGTA**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the UKGTA meeting that took place in London in October?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1267 to 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1267 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - INTUR**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's participation at the Intur tourism trade fair in Valladolid from 24-27 November?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266, 1268 to 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1268 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB - INTUR**

How many persons made up the official Gibraltar delegation to the Intur tourism fair in November and what offices do they hold?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266, 1267, 1269 to 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.



ORAL

NO. 1269 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB - INTUR**

How many journalists from the Spanish travel trade press attended the informal gathering at the Gibraltar stand which took place on 24 November?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266 to 1268, 1270 to 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1270 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – BRISTOL EXHIBITION**

How many persons made up the GTB delegation to the exhibition held in Bristol on 30 November and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266 to 1269, 1271 to 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1271 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – BRISTOL EXHIBITION**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the GTB exhibition held in Bristol on 30 November?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266 to 1270, 1272, 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1272 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – WORLD TRAVEL MARKET**

Can Government say whether they have now taken a policy decision to exhibit at the World Travel Market next year and if so list the criteria on which this decision is based?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266 to 1271, 1273, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1273 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB - UKGTA**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the UKGTA brochure and of the UKGTA brochure launch which took place in November?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266 to 1272, 1316 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1274 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – GIBRALTAR/MANCOMUNIDAD**

Has the Tourism sub-committee set up between Gibraltar and the Mancomunidad met again after the meeting of 15 April, and if so where and on what date?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

No.

**NO. 1275 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MADRID OFFICE**

Can Government say whether the Gibraltar Office in Madrid now has a Marketing Co-ordinator in post?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes, a Marketing Executive is in post.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1275 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

On what date was the person selected for the job?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not have that information with me but his appointment has been quite recent. I would guess it would be some time in the beginning to the middle of November.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The post had been vacant for some time, was this one of the people who applied originally?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I believe when the vacancy was advertised originally there were applicants, I think the selection board did not feel there were suitable candidates, I think it was re-advertised again. I am not sure whether it was re-advertised again or not because I have lost track but at least twice it was advertised and the last time it was advertised there were two applicants and we finally managed to find a candidate suitable for the post.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the person who was selected a Gibraltarian or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.



ORAL

**NO. 1276 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MINISTER’S OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister with responsibility for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business since the last Question-Time in this House, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I have been away on three occasions as follows:

17 October	UKGTA meeting in London, and other meetings in London at the Gibraltar Government Office in London; Gibraltar Day in the City of London at the Guildhall.
14-16 November	UKGTA meeting in London and launch of UKGTA brochure, both at the Gibraltar Government Office in London; visit to World Travel Market at Excel; Shipping presentation in Athens, Greece at the Athens Hilton.
30 November	GTB Roadshow in Bristol, England at the Bristol City Marriott Hotel.

ORAL

**NO. 1277 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said:

- (a) that they had stayed at a hotel;
- (b) that they had not stayed at a hotel;

since August 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location, and in the case of those who stayed in hotels what was the average length of stay in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information in respect of September, October and November 2005 has only been partially inputted. It is not possible to provide the information sought in respect of these months at this stage.

The information in relation to August is contained in the table that I now hand the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 1277 of 2005**

Place of Interview  
Number of Interviews Stayed at Hotel

	Total No of Interviews	Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Average Length of stay	Frontier	Average Length of stay	Elsewhere	Average Length of stay
Aug 05	1,943	12	11	6.2	1	9.5	-	-

Place of Interview  
Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel

	Total Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Port	Frontier	Waterport	Marina	Coach Park
Aug 05	1,931	9	40	1,882	-	-	-

ORAL

**NO. 1278 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – NUMBER OF CIVIL SERVANTS**

How many persons are employed in tourism as civil servants and what posts do they hold as at 30 November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1279 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1279 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - GDC**

How many persons are employed in tourism through the Gibraltar Development Corporation as at 30 November 2005 and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The only Civil Servant who has a tourism role is the Chief Executive of the Ministry for Trade, Industry, Employment and Communications.

There are 73 GDC staff employed in tourism. Details are set out in the table that I now hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 1279 of 2005**

**GTB POSTS - GDC EMPLOYEES**

<b>Title</b>	<b>No of posts</b>	
CHIEF EXECUTIVE	1	
SALES & MARKETING MANAGER	1	
PRODUCT MANAGER	1	
FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION MANAGER	1	
UPPER ROCK MANAGER	1	
TERMINALS MANAGER	1	
PA TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE	1	
ACCOUNTS SENIOR OFFICER	1	
SALES & MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR	1	
INFORMATION CO-ORDINATOR	1	
UPPER ROCK CO-ORDINATOR	1	
SITE OFFICERS' SUPERVISOR	1	
MAINTENANCE CREW SUPERVISOR	1	
TERMINALS SUPERVISORS	2	
SALES & MARKETING OFFICER	1	
SENIOR INFORMATION OFFICER	1	
PRODUCT OFFICER	1	
UPPER ROCK ADMINISTRATION & ACCOUNTS OFFICERS	3	
UPPER ROCK SITE OFFICERS	23	
TERMINALS ASSISTANTS	3	
ACCOUNTS & ADMINISTRATION OFFICER	1	
INFORMATION OFFICERS	8	
VISITOR INFORMATION PATROL OFFICERS	1	
RECEPTIONISTS (PART TIME)	2	
UPPER ROCK MAINTENANCE CREW	8	
COACH PARK ATTENDANTS	2	
ACCOUNTS ASSISTANT	1	
MESSENGER	1	
<b>TOTAL (GIBRALTAR)</b>	<b>71</b>	
MARKETING EXECUTIVE	1	
ADMINISTRATION OFFICER	1	
<b>TOTAL (MADRID)</b>	<b>2</b>	

ORAL

**NO. 1280 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOWER OF HOMAGE**

Can Government provide a detailed breakdown of the restoration work carried out at the Tower of Homage, giving a breakdown of the cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1281 of 2005.

**NO. 1281 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOWER OF HOMAGE**

On what date was the Tower of Homage closed for restoration works and on what date are such works expected to be complete and the Tower re-opened?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Tower of Homage was closed for restoration works on 7 April 2003. The first phase of the works concentrated on the upper floors and the second phase concentrated on the lower floors, chambers and passageway. The cost of the restoration works has been:

Phase 1	-	56,052 Euros
Phase 2	-	47,575 Euros

It is expected the works will be concluded in the spring and the target date for re-opening the Tower to the public is May 2006.

The restoration of the Tower of Homage has involved:

1. Careful manual removal of all areas that had been reconstructed and covered with grey Portland cement.
2. Consolidation of the original masonry.
3. Consolidation of all walls including the injection of lime and sand mortar to all joints between stones.
4. Filling of spaces where original materials disappeared with lime and sand mortar, tinted appropriately.
5. Study and exposing of architectural elements, such as windows and doors, previously hidden.
6. Removal of modern flooring.
7. Search and, where found, consolidation of original floors.
8. Study and execution of plan to conserve original floors where found and expose them for viewing.



9. Filling of spaces in floors with materials of similar character.
10. Refurbishment of existing windows.
11. Study of water penetration through the roof of the Tower.
12. Treatment of roof of the Tower to prevent water penetration in the future.

The Tower of Homage was in a very bad state of conservation, particularly given the degree of damage caused by the use of Portland cement to the walls in the 1970's. The current works, done following international criteria and standards of conservation and restoration, have given the Tower a new lease of life.

During the works new chambers, tunnels and passages, previously unknown, have been discovered and excavated. A chamber that was utilised during the Second World War and which used a medieval secret exit from the castle has been discovered. The deep well of the castle has also been surveyed. Finally, the results are still under study but I am pleased to inform the House that the Gibraltar Museum is of the view that the original tower of the castle, perhaps dating to the 12<sup>th</sup> Century, has been found within the 14<sup>th</sup> Century tower. This significantly raises the heritage value of the site, placing its origins to 200 years earlier than previously known.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1280 AND 1281 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister who carried out the actual restoration work?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have obviously a very strong involvement from the Chief Executive of my Ministry because of the tourism dimension to this but it is a project that has been led by the Ministry for Heritage and especially the Director of the Museum. Therefore, I am happy to supply any additional information that he may want.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the Minister could write with that answer, who carried out the restoration work.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I will write to the hon Member.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1282 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HEAD 104**

Can Government give a breakdown of the following Forecast Outturns for 2004/2005 shown in Head 104, showing the amounts paid, to whom, and the date of payment:

- (a) £136,000 Sub-Head 6 Upper Rock Improvements and Maintenance;
- (b) £244,000 Sub-Head 7 Beaches Improvements and Maintenance;
- (c) £225,000 Sub-Head 9 Tourist Beautification Projects;
- (d) £1,106,000 Sub-Head 10 Other Development Projects?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1283 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1283 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HEAD 104**

Can Government say how much of the following estimated expenditure for the financial year 2005/2006 shown in Head 104 has been spent as at 30 November 2005, showing who the money was paid to, on what date and for what purpose:

- (a) £650,000 Sub-Head 6 Upper Rock Improvements and Maintenance;
- (b) £268,888 Sub-Head 7 Beaches Improvements and Maintenance;
- (c) £156,000 Sub-Head 9 Tourist Beautification Projects?
- (d) £889,000 Sub-Head 10 Other Beautification Projects?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1283 of 2005****Answer to Question 1282**

- (a) Out-turn in respect of Head 104 Subhead 6, Upper rock improvements and maintenance.

DATE OF PAYMENT	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
24.06.04	CIAP	TOILET SEATS	£108.00
30.06.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	JEW'S GATE TICKET OFF. RENOVAT.	£18,938.06
30.06.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPLACE WATER PIPE AT APES DEN	£2,510.01
31.07.04	SIGN DESIGN	MANUFACTURE UPPER ROCK SIGNS	£1,640.00
01.07.04	SIGN DESIGN	TARIFF SIGN RE:UPP.ROCKENTRANCE	£400.00
21.07.04	G. I. B.	AIR FARES - MR.SMITH& M. HEWITT	£168.20
01.07.04	MASTERSERVICE	CLEANING- FIREBREAKSAT U.ROCK	£14,998.00
01.07.04	MASTERSERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES	£7,310.00
01.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	WORKS TO P.PHILIP ARCH &.BALCONY	£6,339.12
21.07.04	BRISTOL HOTEL	HOTEL ACCOMM. RE.M. HEWITT	£105.40
29.07.04	SIGN DESIGN	EUROPA RD.SIGNS-JUNCTION B.VISTA	£570.00
10.08.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIR PLAQUES AT Q. BALCONY	£834.00
10.08.04	SIGN DESIGN	NEW SIGNS AT EUROPA ROAD	£635.00
10.08.04	MASTERSERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES & AREAS	£4,422.50
10.08.04	G.I.B.	AIR TICKET RE: MR. HEWITT	£50.00
10.08.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS OF UPPER ROCK SITES	£22,648.52
08.09.04	MASTERSERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES SEPT. 04	£4,422.50
20.09.04	MASTERSERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES JULY 04	£4,422.50
20.09.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIR TO WATER INGRESS-CRUISE T.	£1,864.43
10.11.04	G.J.B.S.LTD	RENEWAL OF TILES AT CRUISE TER.	£2,180.80
14.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	WORKS RE:UPPER GALLERIES	£22,620.00
15.04.05	GIB.ELECT. AUTH.	ELECTRICITY WORKS CARRIED OUT	£855.52
12.01.05	MASTERSERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES OCT.05	£4,422.50
22.02.05	GREEN ARC	REP.OF FENCING - W.PORT ROUNDABOUT	£1,260.00
20.03.05	MED.COMP.SERV	REPAIR EPOS MACHINE-UPPERROCK	£2,570.00
23.03.05	ELECTRSONIC	YRLY MAINT.CHARGE-ST.MICHAELS CAVE	£7,990.00
29.03.05	GREEN ARC	REP.FENCING- W.PORT ROUNDABOUT	£1,050.00
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>£135,335.06</b>

- (b) Out-turn in respect of Head 104 Subhead 9, Tourist Beautification projects.

DATE	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
01.05.04	MASTER SERVICE	EASTER TOILET FACILITES & APRIL TOILET FACILITIES	£15,526.45
01.05.04	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES	£2,895.75
21.05.04	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES	£13,113.10
07.06.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS TO TOILETS	£65.00
24.06.04	MARR CO.	PAINTING MATERIALS	£818.60
24.06.04	P.C.A	PAINTING MATERIALS	£3,084.00
01.07.04	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING WESTERN BEACH & GAVIOTA SHOW	£3,706.50
01.07.04	MASTER SERVICE	CABLES & BUOYS	£3,188.00
01.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPLACE SHOWER PLATES	£281.00
01.07.04	SAVERLAND	KETTLES	£39.97
01.07.04	OXY LTD	MATERIALS	£336.81

01.07.04	CORNER SHOP	PAINT	£70.80
01.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	LITTLE BAY RAILINGS	£6,489.36
21.07.04	BELL PHARMACY	FIRST AID	£68.10
21.07.04	SPORTS&LEISURE	WHISTLES	£80.00
21.07.04	MASTER SERVICE	REMOVE BOULDERS & INSTALL BINS/CLEANING & TOILET ATTENDANTS	£31,218.40
29.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	POOL COVER CAMP/LITTLE BAY	£491.01
29.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPLACE PADLOCKS	£152.00
29.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	ENGINE CLEANING	£218.20
29.07.04	BOLANOS	ENGINE REPAIRS	£338.30
29.07.04	MASTER SERVICE	BUTTONS & FOOTWASH FOR SHOWERS & CLEANING WESTERN BEACH	£3,492.75
29.07.04	BP OIL	OIL FOR POOL ENGINE	£8.00
29.07.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS	£3,272.49
29.07.04	SIGN DESIGN	BEACH SIGNS	£267.00
29.07.04	SECURITY EXPRESS	ROTUNDA CAR PARK	£2,160.00
10.08.04	C.GAGGERO	MATERIALS	£80.82
10.08.04	P.C.A.	PAINT	£960.00
10.08.04	MARR & CO.	PAINT	£142.35
10.08.04	INTERBUILD	MATERIALS	£195.93
10.08.04	SAVERLAND	BEACH UMBRELLAS	£31.96
10.08.04	E.J. HAMMOND	LIFEGUARD SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	£47.15
10.08.04	BAGLIETTO	FIRST AID	£18.40
10.08.04	SIGN DESIGN	BEACH SIGNS	£50.00
10.08.04	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES & CLEANING WESTERN BEACH	£22,331.50
10.08.04	PETTY CASH	MISCELLANEOUS	£10.00
10.08.04	E.J. HAMMOND	MATERIALS	£260.69
10.08.04	ATLAS	MATERIALS	£13.50
10.08.04	HIRE U SHOP	MATERIALS	£40.00
10.08.04	D&H CERAMICS	MATERIALS	£127.00
03.09.04	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES & CLEANING WESTERN BEACH	£22,331.50
14.09.04	E.J. HAMMOND	CHAIN & PADLOCKS	£45.60
31.08.04	G.C.P. WORKS	OVERTIME RE: WORKERS	£18,653.23
20.09.04	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES	£20,250.00
20.09.04	N.N. SENE	LIFEGUARD TRAINING	£2,690.00
20.09.04	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID	£280.20
20.09.04	A.J. PHONES	RELOAD CARD FOR BEACH SUPERVISOR	£25.00
20.09.04	INTERBUILD	PAINT	£119.70
20.09.04	CORNER SHOP	MATERIALS	£319.60
20.09.04	BROOKWEST	EMPTYING SEWAGE & REMOVE SILT	£5,200.00
20.09.04	BROOKWEST	EMPTYING SEWAGE	£2,795.00
20.09.04	INTERBUILD	MATERIALS	£51.00
20.09.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS	£601.00
20.09.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS	£19,674.56
20.09.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS	£509.40
20.09.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS	£553.00
01.10.04	OXY LTD	DISINFECTANT & CHLORINE	£134.03
10.11.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REMOVING GREASING TAPS	£420.00
12.11.04	C. GAGGERO	TIMBER	£18.20
19.11.04	INTERBUILD	FLOOR PAINT	£39.90
19.11.04	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID	£238.70
19.11.04	ATLAS	PIPE FITTING RE: POOL	£25.91
24.11.04	A.J. PHONES	RELOAD CARD FOR BEACH SUPERVISOR	£25.00

01.12.04	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET ATTENDANTS	£3,680.00
09.12.04	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID	£561.80
19.12.04	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID	£425.85
09.12.04	H.SHEPPARD	LANYARD	£39.60
19.12.04	ABEGON FITTERS	COCO MATTING	£43.50
19.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	BEACH REPAIRS	£4,333.00
19.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	BEACH REPAIRS	£555.00
19.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	BEACH REPAIRS	£1,892.79
19.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	BEACH REPAIRS	£271.00
19.12.04	ST.JOHNS AMB.	ICEPACKS	£20.00
19.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	BEACH REPAIRS	£450.00
19.12.04	WYSE HIRE	HIRE EQUIPMENT	£251.00
19.12.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS TO SHOWERS	£95.00
01.10.04	OXY LTD	DISINFECTANT & CHLORINE	-£55.74
31.07.04	CHELLSONS	BINOCULARS	£95.70
12.01.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET ATTENDANTS	£11,240.00
12.01.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET ATTENDANTS	£940.00
01.02.05	BOLANOS	SPARES RE: EQUIPMENT	£402.00
22.02.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES	£3,320.00
22.02.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	REMOVAL OF STEEL STAIRS	£548.00
20.03.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FACILITIES	£4,150.00
			<b>£243,949.92</b>

(c) Out-turn in respect of Head 104 Subhead 9, Tourist Beautification projects.

DATE OF PAMENT	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
20-Apr-04	BUDRANI	Misc	£50.75
24-Jun-04	G.J.B.S.	Our Lady of Sorrows restoration works window	£5,954.00
01-Jul-04	ROCKCOOL	Air conditioning House of Assembly	£13,222.85
01-Jul-04	PRINCE RESEARCH	Moorish Castle works (prison relocation)	£130,257.40
21-Jul-04	G.L.R.C.	Mid harbour rec	£5,000.00
29-Jul-04	SHARROCK SHAND	Frontier canopy	£49,139.00
29-Jul-04	SHARROCK SHAND	Frontier canopy	£89,440.00
29-Jul-04	COLD-AIRE	Air conditioning Air Terminal	£14,187.40
10-Aug-04	ARCADE KEYS	Boots repairs	£70.50
10-Aug-04	GLASS HOUSE	Signs	£53.00
08-Sep-04	COLD-AIRE	Air conditioning Air Terminal	£6,080.35
08-Sep-04	SHARROCK SHAND	Frontier canopy	£68,553.00
01-Oct-04	G.J.B.S.	Our Lady of Sorrows fit frames and window	£5,483.16
14-Oct-04	SHARROCK SHAND	Frontier canopy	£41,093.00
10-Mar-05	PRINCE RESEARCH	Moorish Castle works (prison relocation)	£42,000.00
29-Mar-05	PRINCE RESEARCH	Moorish Castle works (prison relocation)	£14,000.00
			<b><u>£484,584.41</u></b>

(d) Out-turn in respect of Head 104 Subhead 10, Other Development projects:

DATE	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
30.04.04	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION- APR. 04	£5,000.00
01.05.04	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION- MAR.04	£5,000.00
21.05.04	FABRICOM AIRPORT	CONVEYING EQUIPMENT GIB.AIRPORT	£19,535.98

	SYS.		
21.05.04	TS. LOGISTICS	BAGGAGE CONVEYOR SPARES	£252.00
27.05.04	REDWOOD	DEL.OF GOODS RE: ELECTRONIC UK	£252.50
27.05.04	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION-MAY 04	£5,000.00
01.06.04	ALFRIEND SWANTEX	FLOODLIGHTING-NORTH FACE ROCK	£38,133.24
29.07.04	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR MANAG. FEES JULY-AUG 04	£10,000.00
14.10.04	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR MANAG. FEES- SEPT. 04	£5,000.00
14.10.04	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIR FLOODLIGHTING - ROCK FACE	£1,230.00
10.11.04	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR MANAG. FEES - OCT. 04	£5,000.00
01.02.05	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR MANAG.FEES - NOV-DEC 04	£10,000.00
22.02.05	D.H.V.	WESTERN BEACH RECLAMATION	£19,575.00
01.01.05	PROJECTS	NON EU JV TO US	£690,925.31
28.02.05	GIB. ELECTRICITY AUTH.	GUNWHARF&COALING ISLAND	£11,136.87
01.03.05	MACKLEY TRICON	MARINA COALING ISLAND	£178,245.02
01.03.05	D.H.V.	WESTERN BEACH RECLAMATION	£2,270.28
10.03.05	MACKLEY TRICON	GUNWHARF&COALING ISLAND	£45,891.47
11.03.05	D.H.V.	WESTERN BEACH RECLAMATION	£1,545.28
11.03.05	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	WESTERN BEACH RECLAMATION	£4,620.00
23.03.05	D.H.V.	WESTERN BEACH RECLAMATION	£1,545.28
16.03.05	adj. Pv 1153	OVERPAYMENTS	-£2,270.28
29.03.05	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	MID HARBOUR REC. JAN/FEB/MAR	£15,000.00
29.03.05	M.E . BELILO	PROF.CHARGES - COALING ISLAND MARINA & GUNWHARF	£30,170.00
31.03.05	GIB. LAND RECLAM. CO	REVERSAL OF PAYMENT JV 169	-£14,820.00
			<b>£1,088,237.95</b>

### **Answer to Question 1283**

(a) Expenditure to 30.11.2005 in resepct of Head 104 Subjead 6.

DATE	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
16.05.05		PETTY CASH	£2.40
01.06.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS TO CHARLES V WALL	£784.00
01.06.05	BLANDS	AIR FARE H&H SCULPTORS VISIT	£282.00
20.06.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	CONCRETE BASE - RE:JEW'S GATE TRAFFIC BARRIERS	£1,400.00
20.06.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF FIREBREAKS AT UPPER ROCK	£14,998.00
06.07.05	BRISTOL HOTEL	HOTEL ACCOMM - HEWIT & HALL	£563.00
10.07.05	REDWOOD	COURIER CHARGES	£303.72
03.08.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	FITTING CHAINS AT COACH PARK	£2,718.86
03.08.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	FIT GALVANISED RAILING AT JEW'S GATE	£1,355.25
03.08.05	SELINA	BRACKETS FOR UPPER ROCK SITES	£152.00
03.08.05	REDWOOD	COURIER CHARGES	£233.95
24.08.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES - JULY 05	£4,887.50
30.09.05	H&H SCULPTORS	MAINT.WORKS RE:EXH. AT UPPER ROCK	£3,559.50
10.10.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES - AUG/SEPT 05	£4,887.50
13.10.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES - 1st to 26th Aug	£4,887.50
21.10.05	CAR CARE CENTRE	SIGNS RE: JEWS GATE & ST. MICHAEL'S CAVE	£67.50
17.11.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF SLOPES - 26 Sep to 21 Oct	£4,887.50
21.11.05	PORTMAN LTD	GALVANISED RAILINGS RE: LITTLE BAY	£660.00
			<b>£46,630.18</b>

(b) Expenditure to 30.11.2005 in respect of Head 104 Subhead 7.

DATE	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
12.04.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEAN BEACHES&TOIL. ATT. EASTER	12123.83
12.04.05	BOLANOS	MAINTENANCE-MERCURY ENGINES	319.92
12.04.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEAN BEACHES&TOILET ATT. APRIL 05	3320.00
09.05.05	SAVERLAND	BLEACH BOTTLES	39.60
09.05.05	MONTEVERDE	CLEANING&MAINT.C/BAY-E/BEACH	20970.00
16.05.05	ALTAS	MATERIALS RE: BEACHES	14.56
16.05.05	MRS. H. SHERIFF	RED&YELLOW FLAGS FOR BEACHES	85.00
16.05.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET ATT. & MAINT. OF BEACHES MAY	14947.60
16.05.05	MASTER SERVICE	OFF-SEASON CLEAN. OF BEACHES	13868.60
16.05.05	E.J. HAMMOND	CUTTING STEEL DISCS RE:DEAD WEIGHTS	10.15
16.05.05	SELINA LTD	FLAT BAR RINGS-DEAD WEIGHTS	350.00
16.05.05	MARR CO.	PAINTING MATERIALS	82.40
16.05.05	E.J. HAMMOND	PADLOCKS	313.25
16.05.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	FENCE AT C/BAY&REPAIR TOILETS	2017.10
01.06.05	SAVERLAND	4 KETTLES FOR BEACHES	47.96
01.06.05	FASTAFOOD LTD	MINERAL WATER	86.50
01.06.05	MARR CO.	PAINTING MATERIALS	4181.10
01.06.05	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID KIT	744.40
01.06.05	CHELLSONS	BINOCULARS RE: LIFEGUARDS	135.60
01.06.05	MARR CO.	PAINTING MATERIALS	197.90
01.06.05	E.J. HAMMOND	CHICKEN WIRE RE: BEACHES	59.80
01.06.05	MASTER SERVICE	ARTICULATED WALKWAYS-BEACHES	11003.16
01.06.05	E.J. HAMMOND	PADLOCKS-TOILETS&SHOWERS	313.25
10.06.05	A.J. PHONES	GIBTEL RELOAD CARD	25.00
10.06.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF L/BAY&CAMP BAY	3320.00
10.06.05	SPORTS&LEISURE	WHISTLES & WRISTBANDS	318.00
10.06.05	CEMATS	SAND & GRAVEL	33.75
10.06.05	BHARAT LTD	LIFEGUARD UNIFORMS	1387.75
10.06.05	CIAP	GLASS WIRE & MIRRORS - CATALAN BAY	66.93
16.06.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEAN.&MAINT.CAMP BAY&L/BAY	23102.84
20.06.05	CORNER SHOP	PAINTING MATERIALS	45.20
20.06.05	KOALA HOLDINGS	MOTOR OIL RE: OUTBOARDS	99.75
20.06.05	E.J. HAMMOND	BOLTS,HINGES & SCREWS	119.80
20.06.05	GTR TECH.SYSTEMS	BATTERIES RE:WALKIE TALKIES	47.00
20.06.05	G.F.I. TRADING CO.	HYDRAYLIC OIL PUMP-CAMP BAY	45.00
20.06.05	M.SHEPPARD & CO	SPARK PLUGS&FUEL CONECTORS	91.30
20.06.05	P.C.A. LTD	PAINTS FOR SWIMMING POOLS	1522.00
24.06.05		PETTY CASH (MISC)	49.49
06.07.05	MARR CO.	PAINT FOR CAMP BAY	44.95
10.07.05	WYSE HIRE LTD	HIRE OF EQUIPMENT FOR BEACHES	257.86
10.07.05	CEMATS	SAND & GRAVEL- DEAD WEIGHTS	86.50
07.07.05	E.J. HAMMOND	RAWL BOLTS	22.50
07.07.05	MARR CO.	PAINTING MATERIALS	32.80
07.07.05	INTERBUILD	BUILDING MATERIALS	24.00
07.07.05	P.C.A. LTD	PAINT	450.00
07.07.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS RE: BEACHES	20325.70
07.07.05	AQUAGIB	MAINT. PUMBING STATION-CAMP BAY	288.50
07.07.05	OXY LTD	CHLORINE TABLETS FOR POOLS	154.98
07.07.05	PORTMAN LTD	MODIFICATION TO BEACH CABINS	350.00
07.07.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS - BEACHES	53.35
07.07.05	SIGN DESIGN	MANUFACTURE OF SIGNS	80.00
07.07.05	SIGN DESIGN	MANUFACTURE OF SIGNS	68.00
20.07.05		PETTY CASH (MISC)	57.80



20.07.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS	134.74
20.07.05	A.J. PHONES	GIBTEL RELOAD CARD	25.00
20.07.05	SIGN DESIGN	MANUFACTURE OF SIGNS	20.00
20.07.05	OXY LTD	CHLORINE TABLETS FOR POOLS	154.98
20.07.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	BOAT DEMARCATION POLES	372.00
20.07.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET FAC. WEST.BEACH JUN/JULY	27730.00
03.08.05	S. OLIVERO	REFURBISH TOILETS-CAMP BAY	12650.00
03.08.05	MASTER SERVICE	GAVIOTA SHOWER BASES EAST. BCH	325.00
03.08.05	E.J. HAMMOND	MATERIALS RE:SHOWERS/EAST. BCH	8.40
03.08.05	GIBTELECOM	RENTAL -LIFEGUARD POSTS -JUNE	623.18
03.08.05	GIBTELECOM	RENTAL -LIFEGUARD POSTS -JULY	147.50
03.08.05	BEACON PRESS	CORK NOTICE BOARD -BEACHES	24.95
03.08.05	M.SHEPPARD & CO	ENGINE STOPS-OUTBOARD ENG.	9.60
03.08.05	B.I.A. LTD	PLASTIC CHAIRS-LIFEGUARDS	42.00
03.08.05	ST.JOHN'S AMBUL.	ICEPACKS RE: BEACHES	40.00
03.08.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS - POOLS	71.30
03.08.05	SIGN DESIGN	MANUF. OF SIGNS-WESTERN BCH	24.00
03.08.05	E.J. HAMMOND	MATERIALS RE: SWIMMING POOL	8.75
03.08.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS-CAMP BAY	22.75
03.08.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS-BCH.SHOWER	10.12
09.08.05	SELINA LTD	METAL TUBE-LIFEGUARD BOAT	78.00
09.08.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS	15.20
09.08.05	GIBRAL FLORA	REEDBED- EASTERN BEACH	9.95
09.08.05	SIGN DESIGN	MANUF. OF SIGNS-CAMP BAY	30.00
09.08.05	ELECT.DISTRIBUTOR	FITTING CAMP BAY CHANG.ROOM	6.35
09.08.05	E.J. HAMMOND	RIVET GUN FOR BEACHES	9.50
09.08.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	UNB.TOILET DRAINS-EASTERN BCH	114.00
24.08.05	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID KIT	691.35
24.08.05	SIGN DESIGN	MANUF.BEACH CLEANING SIGNS	132.00
24.08.05	AQUAGIB	SUPPLY OF METER	43.30
24.08.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET ATT.&CLEAN.WEST.BCH AUG	27340.00
24.08.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MAT. LITTLE BAY	22.17
24.08.05	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID KIT	373.95
08.09.05	OXY LTD	WELDING ELECTRODES	28.16
08.09.05	E.J. HAMMOND	MAINTENANCE MATERIALS	20.40
08.09.05	WASTAGE PROD.	WASTAGE PUMPING - CAMP BAY	510.00
08.09.05	A.J. PHONES	GIBTEL RELOAD CARD	25.00
08.09.05	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID KIT	278.00
08.09.05	E.J. HAMMOND	MAINT. MATERIALS - BEACHES	14.50
08.09.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS TO SHOWER ROOMS	510.00
08.09.05	GIBTELECOM	TEL.BILL-LIFEGUARD POST- AUG	87.50
08.09.05	WASTAGE PROD.	WASTAGE PUMPING - CAMP BAY	1020.00
16.09.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	UNBLOCK SEWER - CAMP BAY POOL	114.00
16.09.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIR SHOWER & FOOT BATHS	5293.12
16.09.05	SELINA LTD	HINGES-CATALAN BAY PLAYGROUND	25.00
16.09.05	GIBTELECOM	TEL.BILL-LIFEGUARD POST- SEPT	87.50
30.09.05	G.C.P	OVERTIME FOR WORKERS	20433.70
30.09.05		PETTY CASH (MISC)	26.40
30.09.05	HIRE U SHOP	JUBILEE CLIPS-SANDY BAY RAILING	21.20
11.10.05		PETTY CASH (MISC)	7.55
12.10.05	D&H CERAMICS	SAND&CEMENT-DEAD WEIGHTS	10.20
12.10.05	SELINA LTD	HINGES - WESTERN BCH TOILETS	12.00
13.10.05	MASTER SERVICE	TOILET ATTENDANTS - CAMP/L BAY	1397.14
13.10.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MATERIALS-BEACHES	9.00
13.10.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MAT. CAMP&LITTLE BAY	13.00
13.10.05	WASTAGE PROD.	SEWAGE PUMPING	765.00
13.10.05	ST.JOHN'S AMBUL.	COOLPACKS RE: BEACHES	40.00

13.10.05	A.J. PHONES	GIBTEL RELOAD CARD	25.00
26.10.05	MILL PHARMACY	FIRST AID KIT	77.95
26.10.05	CIAP	PLUMBING MAT. CAMP BAY	36.70
26.10.05	FASTAFOOD LTD	TOILET PAPER CAMP/LITTLE BAY	32.40
11.11.05	N.N. SENE	TRAINING & EXAMS- LIFEGUARDS	2060.00
17.11.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF L/BAY&CAMP BAY	1520.00
17.11.05	MASTER SERVICE	SEWAGE PUMPING	255.00
21.11.05	MASTER SERVICE	CLEANING OF L/BAY&CAMP BAY	1520.00
21.11.05	G.J.B.S. LTD	REPAIRS TO SALT WATER PIPE	63.00

**245450.89**

(c) Expenditure to 30.11.2005 in respect of Head 104 Subhead 9.

DATE	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
12.4.05	CLEANING CENTRE	METAL POLISH	16.80
12.4.05	SHARROCK SHAND	NEW FRONTIER CANOPY	8910.00
16.5.05	P GOMEZ	FEES FOR PROPOSAL EUROPA P	3795.00
20.7.05	SHARROCK SHAND	NEW FRONTIER CANOPY	18797.00
15.8.05	SHARROCK SHAND	NEW FRONTIER CANOPY	999.68

**32518.48**

(d) Expenditure to 30.11.2005 in respect of Head 104 Subhead 10.

DATE	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
12.4.05	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	PROPOSED MARINA COALING ISLAND	213502.40
	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	GUN WHARF	79896.98
	DHV OVER PAYMENTS REC	OVERPAYMENTS	-1545.28
20.6.05	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	PROPOSED MARINA COALING ISLAND	59499.41
	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	GUN WHARF	43071.25
10.7.05	G.L.R.C.	W/BEACH MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION	
9.8.05	G.L.R.C.	W/BEACH MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION	
18.8.05	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	PROPOSED MARINA COALING ISLAND	17686.04
24.8.05	M.E. BELILLO	APPLIC COALING ISLAND MARINA	18500.00
24.8.05	M.E. BELILLO	RELOCATION MARINE SERVICES GUN W	
16.9.05	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	GUN WHARF	14352.15
30.9.05	G.L.R.C.	MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION	5000.00
26.10.05	G.L.R.C.	MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION	10000.00
8.11.05	MACKLEY TRICON WILKIE LTD	MID HARBOUR RECLAMATION	181548.86
			<u>668011.81</u>

ORAL

**NO. 1284 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HEAD 104**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £14,000 shown at Head 104, Sub-Head 13 Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005 Airlines, Ferry and Hotel Assistance Schemes, showing who the money was paid to, on what date and for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1284**

**Head 104 Sub-head 13, Outturn for 2004/5**

All payments relate to the 20 per cent rebate that Government allow hotels on their electricity bills, if these are paid within 3 months of being issued.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Payee</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
10 August 2004	Bristol Hotel	1,837.99
1 February 2005	Bristol Hotel	2,162.79
29 July 2004	Rock Hotel	5,836.55
20 October 2004	Rock Hotel	823.00
30 April 2004	Caleta Hotel	2,865.76
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,526.09</b>

**NO. 1285 OF 2005****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****GTB – TOURISM MARKETING BUDGET**

Can Government say, with a breakdown, how much of the estimated £750,000 tourism marketing budget for 2005/2006 has been spent as at 30 November 2005?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1285****MARKETING SPEND AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2005**

<b>Marketing, Promotions &amp; Advertising</b>	<b>£</b>
Literature	£35,044.36
Activity (Trade)	£15,767.07
Activity (Media)	£5,139.36
Promotional Material	£1,209.39
Advertising	£289,139.55
Trade/Consumer Fairs	£15,577.29
Website	£21,294.89
Recurrent Expenditure	£82,624.05
Events	£45,613.41
Contingencies	£28,241.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£539,650.37</b>

**NO. 1286 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from October 2005 inclusive:

- (a) by charging coaches that use the coach park;
- (b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock;
- (c) in admission fees to the Gibraltar Museum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The revenue for October 2005 was as follows:

Coach Park	£10,020
Upper Rock admissions	£288,102
Museum admissions	£1,918

The revenue for November 2005 was as follows:

Coach Park	£5,690
Upper Rock admissions	£145,486
Museum admissions	£983

ORAL

NO. 1287 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB - AIRLINES**

Can Government say with how many airlines interested in flying to and from Gibraltar they are currently in discussion?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1288 of 2005.

**NO. 1288 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - AIRLINES**

Can Government say on what date was the last contact that they had with:

- (a) Thomsonfly;
- (b) Easyjet;
- (c) Flybe;

regarding their interest in commencing flights to and from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The last meeting with these airlines were held on the following dates:

Thomsonfly	-	3 March 2005
Easyjet	-	10 October 2005
Flybe	-	9 September 2004

The Government are not in active discussions with any other airline at present.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1287 AND 1288 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The contact with Thomsonfly goes back to March this year, do Government consider that that particular airline is still one which the contact is actively being pursued or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is anybody's guess really. We are told that Gibraltar is in their development destinations and therefore one does not know if it is going to take a month, a year or 10 years to actually get up the priority list as far as their commercial interests are concerned. I notice that he asks for the last contact and the reply that I have submitted refers to the last meetings. Probably whoever was drafting the answer in the Gibraltar Tourist Board thought of the meeting as the contact but there are



regular contacts with these airlines, it is not something that we have not seen to for the last eight or nine months.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to re-opening or exploring the possibility of renewing air links between Gibraltar and Morocco is it that there are now no airlines with whom that possibility has been discussed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, because the issue there is one of commercial viability and for example Royal Air Maroc could be a possibility, ones who used to previously fly to Gibraltar no longer operate in the same format as they used to before and I believe they are now restricted to internal flights, even though I think that they still fly to Malaga. The reality is that the demand seems not to be there when airlines have considered the viability of the route.

**NO. 1289 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SCHEDULED FLIGHTS**

How many flights between Gibraltar and the following airports were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis to or from:

- (a) London Gatwick;
- (b) London Heathrow;
- (c) London Luton;
- (d) Manchester;

since October 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The following flights were timetabled:

October 2005		November 2005	
London Gatwick	45	London Gatwick	30
London Heathrow	31	London Heathrow	30
London Luton	31	London Luton	26
Manchester	18	Manchester	17

The total number of air arrivals at Gibraltar as at the end of November 2005 stood at approximately 161,565 for the year. This figure, which is yet to be confirmed, represents an increase of 11 per cent on last year.

Only two flights were cancelled. Both were Manchester flights and both occurred in November 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1289 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I thank the Minister for the figure in respect of arrivals. Does he know how many of those people actually flew to Gibraltar to stay in Gibraltar and how many flew in transit to Spain?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We do not have an accurate figure but the estimates that have been supplied to me whenever I have asked that question is that the figure can fluctuate and even the airlines as well, because the airlines do carry out surveys. For example, if a passenger is flying from London Luton whether they actually live in the Luton area and they try and find out whether there actually is a connecting flight coming in, then the same survey they do whether they are staying in Gibraltar or Spain. The figures that I have fluctuate between 45, 55, 55, 45 and that figure has always fluctuated between that, so whether we put a 50/50 figure to that equation I do not know whether that is strictly correct, but that is the feedback that I get from the airlines and from Immigration here. On Gibraltar passports they do not ask the question but for foreigners they ask, 'are you staying here, are you staying in Gibraltar?' so that we try and keep some form of record. It turns out that it fluctuates between 45 per cent and 55 per cent, one way or the other.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is this the same information which is produced in the Tourism Survey or the Air Traffic Survey, which actually lists the visitors in transit and those staying in Gibraltar?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is probably the case, yes. To be honest, I would not know but if the hon Member is asking me to give him a figure I would say somewhere between 45 per cent and 55 per cent stay in Gibraltar or go to Spain, the figure fluctuates between those.

**NO. 1290 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FERRY SERVICE**

Can Government say whether they have now considered the formal application for a ferry service between Gibraltar and Algeciras and when they expect the licence to be issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1290 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

No they have not considered it, or no they do not expect the licence to be issued or no formal application has been made?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, no formal application has been made so therefore the Government have been unable to give any consideration.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The last time we asked this question in the House, I think it was in October, I was told it was one formal application and one informal application that had been made, the question was tabled because we were chasing up the previous answer.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think what I said was that there was one application that was more formal than another, in the sense that one particular party had actually written in to the Government expressing an interest to do so and putting forward representations to their plan to apply for the licence. The other has been basically in a meeting where I have been expressed an interest in wanting to pursue that. None of them have come

back and said, 'here is an application for me to run this route', although the more formal one I can say has now formulated a proper business plan which is about to be submitted for Government to look at. I assume that it carries relevant and various provisos in there in terms of 'can I get some help?'. I am assuming that but the Government will give consideration to that when that is presented, but no formal application has been made saying, 'I wish to run that service'.

ORAL

**NO. 1291 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

Can Government confirm, given their previous public statements in respect of this matter, why the works at Cammell Laird shipyard on the vessel Rotterdam were not completed in Gibraltar as previously announced by that company and the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1292 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1292 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

Was any asbestos or other hazardous material removed from the vessel Rotterdam before it sailed from Gibraltar and if so was any such removal carried out in a manner that is safe and in keeping with, inter alia, the Factories Ordinance and the Asbestos at Work Regulations and that further any asbestos or other hazardous material removed from the vessel was disposed, stored (aboard or otherwise) or treated safely?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The works were not completed in Gibraltar because the new owners of the Rotterdam wished immediately to dock the vessel in Cammell Laird dock No. 1, which is occupied and will continue to be occupied until mid-January 2006. The vessel has therefore been taken elsewhere where it can be dry docked in accordance with the new owners' timescale.

No asbestos or other hazardous material was removed from the ship during her stay in Gibraltar.

**NO. 1293 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Can Government confirm what progress has now been made in respect of the removal of the grit mountain at Cammell Laird, where it has been removed to, how much remains, what procedures are being followed in respect of the removal, what environmental damage has been done by the failure to remove the grit earlier and what the cost of removal to date has been?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

As at the end of November, 395 lorries had removed over 9,000 tonnes of grit, leaving about 1,500 to 2,000 tonnes which are presently being removed. It was originally estimated that the accumulation of grit contained about 8,000 tonnes. As stated in reply to Question No. 651 of 2005, the spent grit is being taken to an approved disposal site at Los Barrios.

The grit is being removed by a specialist contractor, EWMS, who is ensuring that the grit is handled correctly. The specific procedures being followed are that only approved lorries and approved drivers are used for this job, and the consignment of spent grit is covered in transit.

No assessment has been carried out by Government to establish what, if any, environmental damage has been caused by the spent grit during the time the grit mountain was allowed to accumulate.

The cost of removal of the grit is £360,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1293 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister just repeat the name of the contractor that is being used?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I said EWMS, which is Environmental and Waste Management Services Limited. It is a company registered in Gibraltar whose offices are located at Ragged Staff Wharf in Queensway Quay.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Why have the Government decided not to carry out any assessment of what pollution, if any, there may have been on the site?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not believe that the Government have decided not to carry out any form of assessment. I have assumed that the Environmental Agency, who has responsibility for these matters, would have conducted any survey required if they felt that there was any danger or any chance of there being any environmental damage at all. When they have not conducted the survey I assume it is because they feel that there is no question of there being any environmental damage caused by this.

ORAL

**NO. 1294 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – ATHENS SEMINAR**

How many persons from Gibraltar made up the official Government delegation to the shipping seminar in Athens in November and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1295 and 1296 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1295 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – ATHENS SEMINAR**

How many persons were invited to the shipping seminar held in Athens in November, how many attended and how many were from Gibraltar?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1294 and 1296 of 2005.

**NO. 1296 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – ATHENS SEMINAR**

What was the cost with a breakdown of the shipping seminar held at the Athens Hilton Hotel in November?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Greek shipping interests account for a large proportion of the world fleet. It is therefore important to market the services offered by the Port of Gibraltar and the advantages of the Gibraltar Ship Register at the heart of the Greek shipping world in Athens. The Government identified that it would be more beneficial if a specific Gibraltar event were to be organised, that did not coincide with any other shipping event, so that we would secure the undivided attention of those involved in shipping circles.

This is not the first time that the Government organise a promotional event in Athens. As on previous occasions, the seminar was a public/private partnership, and industry players contributed over £8,000 in total to the cost of the event. This represents about two thirds of the costs. The sponsors ranged from bunker operators Aegean, Vemaoil, Peninsula Petroleum and Java Oil; through to legal firm Marrache & Co; and ship managers Marine Services Gibraltar to Cammell Laird Shiprepair.

The presentation itself was excellent and was well-received by an audience of 75 guests. The Ship Registry, in particular, will now follow up some of the contacts made at the event.

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1296**

75 guests attended the seminar and lunch.

The Port Authority and Department of Shipping sent out 174 invitations.  
Private sector sponsors sent out a further 65 invitations.

The Government delegation at the seminar comprised:

Hon J J Holliday – Minister with responsibility for Shipping  
Mr R Garcia – Chief Executive, Ministry with responsibility for Shipping  
Mr A Davis – Chief Executive, Gibraltar Port Authority  
Captain C Brand - Maritime Administrator (Head of Gibraltar Ship Registry)  
Mr P Canessa – Chief Executive, Gibraltar Tourist Board

The following were the representatives of the shipping industry in Gibraltar:

Mr J Bassadone  
Mr T Christodoulides  
Mr R De la Rosa  
Mr J Ghio  
Mr D Laguea  
Mr F Pitto

Additionally, Mr J Bassadone Jnr, who is based in London, joined the Gibraltar shipping industry representatives.

The costs of the seminar were:

Room and equipment hire	2,407 Euros
Lunch and hospitality	9,815 Euros
Fees for assistant	245 Euros
Flights, subsistence and accommodation	£3,196

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1294 TO 1296 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister lists in terms of the cost, it is clear that it was five persons who made up the Gibraltar Government delegation and a further six or seven were from Gibraltar, one based in London, in terms of the costs it says the flights et cetera were £3,100, the room and equipment 2,400 Euros, the lunch and hospitality was nearly 10,000 Euros. Can I ask the Minister, he mentions the industry paid around £8,000, is that in addition to this or were those £8,000 part of this figure and were included in it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, this is the total cost of which £8,000 come from the private sector sponsorship. If the cost is added up it would be just over 12,000 Euros which is roughly £8,000 plus £3,000 is £11,000 out of which £8,000 were paid for by the private sector, thus the two thirds one third proportion that I mentioned earlier on has been covered by the private sector.

ORAL

NO. 1297 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

Can Government say whether any new applications for a bunkering licence have been made since the last Question-Time in this House?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

None.

ORAL

**NO. 1298 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT - BUNKERING**

What direct revenue have the Government obtained from the provision of bunkers to ships in 2004 and 2005 to date giving a breakdown on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1299 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1299 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SHIP VISITS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar since September 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis for:

- (a) bunkering;
- (b) cargo;
- (c) repairs;

and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1299/2005**

(a) Direct revenue obtained from bunkering operations, on a monthly basis:

<b>2004</b>	
January	£32,751.01
February	£33,540.90
March	£35,477.25
April	£31,315.79
May	£36,179.95
June	£32,705.63
July	£33,624.25
August	£30,502.97
September	£31,172.66
October	£33,636.5
November	£35,643.93
December	£32,686.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£400,237.77</b>

<b>2005</b>	
January	£34,925.12
February	£34,047.41
March	£31,862.36
April	£30,619.03
May	£34,555.38
June	£35,331.61
July	£42,479.79
August	£34,874.57
September	£38,525.51
October	£38,509.36
November	£52,673.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£408,403.14</b>

(b) Number of ship calls since September 2005, on a monthly basis:

	<b><u>Bunkers</u></b>	<b><u>Cargo</u></b>	<b><u>Repairs</u></b>
September 2005	535	1	3
October 2005	507	-	10
November 2005	441	-	9

(c) Tonnes of bunker fuel sold per month:

September 2005	394,499 tonnes
October 2005	388,055 tonnes

The volumes sold in November 2005 are not yet available.

ORAL

**NO. 1300 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**COALING ISLAND - BERTHS**

Can Government say of the boats that now occupy berths at Coaling Island, how many have transferred there from Western Beach?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1301 of 2005.

**NO. 1301 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**COALING ISLAND - BERTHS**

Can Government say how many boats now occupy berths at the new marina in Coaling Island as at 30 November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The management of the Coaling Island marina is vested in the Cormorant Camber Boat Owners Club and not in the Government. The Government cannot say how many berths at Coaling Island were occupied as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

A total of 200 boats that previously had moorings at Western Beach have now been moved, and it is presumed that they have gone to Coaling Island.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1300 AND 1301 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that one of the objectives of the marina was to have a site at which to transfer people from Western Beach, how do the Government measure the success of the policy without the figures?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The Government will be able to have the information available to themselves quite soon. However, the Committee at the moment is involved in all the moving and all the different logistical issues that need to be put in place in order to have the marina fully operational and therefore, they have asked that some time be given to them in order to straighten up their record. Therefore, at that point we will be able to gauge the exact number. We know from the angle of the Port Authority that 200 vessels have moved from Western Beach and we are assuming that they have gone in that direction, I can not see them going anywhere else.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say how many vessels have stayed behind in Western Beach?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe the figure is round about the 100 mark but that is actually the physical count if one goes there today. Having said that, a lot of boats have actually moved in to Western Beach irrespective of the fact that they never had the berth there at all. Therefore, once this exercise is concluded we will know exactly how many there are that had a berth there originally.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case that all the boats now in that new marina have come from Western Beach or are there some that have not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, some of them have not but I just want to make clear that the facilities that were available at Western Beach will no longer be available in the format that they existed, so therefore it should be made clear that Western Beach facilities will no longer be available once the whole exercise has been completed.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what will happen to the 100 who are now located at Western Beach, are there any plans for those people?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Could I just add by way of clarification that all the boats who were at Western Beach had the opportunity to move to the Coaling Island, some chose not to do so because they did not agree with this or they did not agree with that. Government have made it clear that we will not be maintaining a facility in both places, so those that chose not to go will have to make alternative arrangements for their boats. The Government may have some alternative facilities in the area of Waterport but the Government are not going to be operating Western Beach in the future. The whole point in doing the other investment is because Western Beach could not be made reasonably safe at reasonable cost because of the weather exposure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What has been the investment in the new marina?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The total amount, I have not got the exact figure here, but it is roughly about £1.1 million.

ORAL

**NO. 1302 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS - COMPUTERS**

What was the value and number of computer components imported into Gibraltar since September 2005 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1303 and 1304 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1303 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of goods vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since September 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1302 and 1304 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1304 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of private motor vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since September 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.



**Answer to Question 1304 to 2005**

- (a) Value of computer hardware imported since September 2005 inclusive.

September 2005	£345,000
October 2005	£594,000

- (b) Value and the number of goods vehicles imported by licensed dealers since September 2005 inclusive.

	Value (£ thousand)	Number
September 2005	38	4
October 2005	27	13

There were no goods vehicles imported by individuals in this period.

- (c) Value and number of private motor vehicles imported by licensed dealers and private individuals since September 2005 inclusive.

- (i) imported by private individuals

	Value (£ thousand)	Number
September 2005	216	42
October 2005	119	30

- (ii) imported by licensed dealers

	Value (£ million)	Number
September 2005	5.3	386
October 2005	5.7	403

**NO. 1305 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NUMBER OF MEETINGS**

How often and on what dates have the following met:

- (a) the Tourism Advisory Council since 22 September 2005;
- (b) the Port Advisory Council since 8 September 2005;
- (c) the E-Business Advisory Council since 1 September 2005;
- (d) the Business Advisory Council since 15 September 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The Development and Planning Commission met on:

12<sup>th</sup> October  
24<sup>th</sup> October  
23<sup>rd</sup> November  
5<sup>th</sup> December

The Advisory Councils meet quarterly, and they were next due to meet in November and December as follows:

Business Advisory Council	- Met on 24 <sup>th</sup> November
Port Advisory Council	- Met on 8 <sup>th</sup> December
Tourism Advisory Council	- Due to meet on 15 <sup>th</sup> December
E-Business Advisory Council	- Due to meet on 15 <sup>th</sup> December

ORAL

**NO. 1306 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – VALUATION LIST**

Can Government state how many residential units were (a) added and (b) removed from the Valuation List for Rating purposes in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1307 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1307 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – VALUATION LIST**

Can Government state how many residential units were (a) added and (b) removed from the Valuation List for Rating purposes in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 111 units were added in 2004/2005 and four units were deleted.

**NO. 1308 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GOVERNMENT LEASES**

Can Government say, in relation to the area occupied by Rock Motors and the BP petrol station to the south of the Waterport roundabout:

- (a) is the area a Government lease;
- (b) if so what is the area in square metres comprised in the lease;
- (c) what was the unexpired period in the lease;
- (d) has there been a transfer of lease and an application for change of use and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The area in question is a Government lease, over a property containing about 1216m<sup>2</sup> which has an unexpired residue of 149 years 3 months.

There has not been any formal application by the lessee to transfer the lease or for a change of use.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1308 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister says there has been no formal application, has there been any informal contact with that objective in mind?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I understand that there is an interested party in the area in question who has met with LPS and exposed to LPS some of their thinking in order to gauge Government thinking on their proposed plans. That is as far as it has gone, there has not been any formal meeting with the Government at Ministerial level on the matter.

**NO. 1309 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GDC EMPLOYEES**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the following items shown as Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005:

- (a) £81,000 Business Advisory Unit?
- (b) £36,000 Inward Investment and Lands?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The figures relate to the salaries of the GDC officers employed by the Business Advisory Unit and the Investment and Lands Division.

The GDC staff at the Business Advisory Unit consisted of the head of Unit and a Business Adviser. Their salaries came to £69,535. The balance related to social insurance contributions, pension schemes et cetera.

The GDC staff at the Investment and Lands Division consisted of one Grade V Officer. His basic salary was £30,119. The balance relates to social insurance contributions, pension contributions et cetera.

ORAL

**NO. 1310 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUEENSWAY QUAY**

Can Government state whether a premium has been paid or will be paid to the Government for the granting of permission to carry out the island reclamation at Queensway Quay?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1311 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1311 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUEENSWAY QUAY**

Can Government confirm that once the island reclamation at Queensway Quay is completed it will become Crown Land subject to a lease for the proposed development and if so has the premium for the granting of this lease already been agreed and what is the sum involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A premium consisting of £500,000 and the surrender of No. 40 Berth at Gun Wharf was paid for the island project and the rights to develop a low density project on the north end of the former Camber.

Once the island reclamation at Queensway is completed it will become Crown Land. This land mass is already the subject of a lease.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1310 AND 1311 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the £500,000 premium was the payment for the land or the lease rather?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

And the development of it, yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was the release of No. 40 Berth, which appears to be part of the value, something that the developer that is doing that already had?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That now belongs to the Government, is that correct?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, it was returned back to the Government however, the question relates to how it is today. I think it may have been released to the MOD as part of the MOD lands agreement.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the £500,000 an amount that has been credited to the Improvement and Development Fund or has it gone somewhere else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I believe that is the case.

ORAL

**NO. 1312 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PLANNING PERMISSION TO OEM LTD**

Can Government give the total area in square metres, with a breakdown in square metres for each component part of the different project sites, for which OEM (International) Limited will pay the Government £15 million?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1262 and 1313 of 2005.

**NO. 1313 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NORTH GORGE**

To what site are the present users of North Gorge being relocated to make way for the developments there and when is this expected to happen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

OEM will pay the Government a £15 million premium for the following sites:

Buena Vista Barracks Site	-	13,330m <sup>2</sup>
North Gorge	-	15,400m <sup>2</sup>
Cumberland Site	-	3,600m <sup>2</sup>
Rosia Tanks	-	3,350m <sup>2</sup>

The area of the sites is approximate.

Present users of North Gorge will be relocated and discussions in this regard are ongoing. The Government do not wish to prejudice these discussions by providing detailed information on this matter at this stage.

Five written representations were received from the public in respect of the Cumberland Road development. One of these represented an association of North Pavilion Road tenants. 483 written representations were received from the public in respect of the Rosia Tanks development.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1262, 1312 AND 1313 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Rosia Tanks representations received is one of those 483 a petition?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the petition was made to the Government and not to the Development and Planning Commission and was delivered to the Government well after the period of representations being made to the Commission.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given the whole concept of the public being able to express their views and express objections or support at projects, what threshold do the Government consider to be acceptable before they decide to look at something again, given if a high volume of objections is received?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Is the hon Member referring to Government or to the Development and Planning Commission?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The DPC or the Government as the majority stakeholder in the DPC.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I can say that the Development and Planning Commission does not have a threshold by which they look at things depending on the quantity of representations. If one looks at the representations made by the 483 written submissions, most of them were stereotyped. In other words, most of them were saying the same thing signed by different people and so therefore what the Commission considers is not the number of people that have written submissions but the contents of the various issues that are raised. Therefore, if 483 people were to write objecting to one particular aspect of the project then the Commission would be considering obviously the strength of feeling, but on the other hand that it is referring to one particular item only. In respect of the Government, the Government make their decisions not based on submissions either, I do not think there is a threshold by which if they get 3,000 signatures we look at it again, if they do not then we do not. I think the Government have a wider remit of responsibilities that they need to consider in any of these particular cases, so therefore it is not just the interest of the 400 odd people that write in or the 3,000 submissions, but actually they look at a far wider range of issues and responsibilities as a Government in order to deliver their policies generally.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My point was that in relation to the 483 objections, firstly I suppose people are entitled to have a similar view or feel equally strongly about a particular aspect of the project whether it is heritage or not. My question is a wider question in relation to the value or the weight which such public objections or representations have with the Government or with the DPC, and how far is that a criteria in deciding whether a building should have two floors less or whether it should be located somewhere else? That is my question.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

One has to understand that each case is considered on its own merit and representations are very much taken on board. We only have to see the example of the applications for the funicular. The funicular had representations made but the

Development and Planning Commission did not take its views on the funicular based on the 7,000 signatures but on the merits of what was being presented before the Commission to consider, and each case is actually considered on its own merits and not on the quantities or number of people who actually sign a petition. Otherwise, we might as well hand over the Government to the 7,000 of those petitioners, we have to take these things very much on board and the Commission does take a very serious view of peoples' views but one thing is taking it on board and another thing is not being governed by other peoples' views and not what we feel as a Government we ought to be doing.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister whether OEM as an applicant were allowed to present submissions before the Development and Planning Commission?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Development and Planning Commission is not going to allow objectors to appear before the Commission.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Obviously my question was whether OEM.....

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am getting on to that but we had representations made by the objectors to do that and we have had those requests before and if one actually opens up the possibility for that to happen, then decision making would become a very difficult and long process. I think the public now, since the year 2000, have the ability to be able to make representations to the Development and Planning Commission and therefore we have opened up the possibility of public consultation, something which never existed before let me say. So therefore the public has to be made aware of the fact and reminded that it is only till the year 2000 that they are now able to make representations. When it comes to the application, which is the point the hon Member just made, the fact is that the Commission does sometimes call in applicants in order to make submissions but not for them to present their case but to be questioned by the Commission on issues that may not be clear to them. It is especially so with big projects where there may be quite a wide range of issues which are maybe not clear at outline planning. Let me say that some of these queries are based sometimes on some of the points that are made by the objectors themselves, so we take those on board and where we feel we are not able to clarify the issues amongst ourselves, we actually call the applicants in. This happened in the case of OEM, they were asked to come in with their team of architects to be able to explain to the Commission certain issues that we wanted explaining, and that was done.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When in 2000 this provision was made in the law to allow people to object it was something that Opposition Members supported but in any case there was always provision in the law for people to object before the DPC. What the Minister has said then is that OEM were allowed to appear before the DPC in order to be questioned by the DPC but not to present their case, whereas the objectors were not allowed to present their case directly to the DPC.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I want to clarify the matter so as to ensure that there is no misunderstanding. The applicants were not allowed, the applicants were called in by the Development and Planning Commission to be questioned on certain aspects of the project that needed clarification. The objectors to this project, like objectors to all other projects in the past, have never been allowed to make submissions to DPC because we feel that this is a practice which would make the working of the DPC extremely long-winded and applications would never get by. We had to listen to 483 applicants for example, who differentiates amongst those 483 objectors who would have the right to object, everybody could feel that they had the same right to object and it would become practically impossible for anybody to allow that to happen. It does not happen anywhere else and we are not going to allow it now.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1314 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DU FAROL BUILDING**

Can Government say in respect of the tenders received for the proposed demolition of the Du Farol Building and Signal Fog House, whether any bid was received which was lower than that of the successful tenderer, in what amount, and in what respects it was judged to be not fully compliant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There was one tender that was lower than that of the successful tenderer. This tender was in the sum of £58,374.63.

The tender was not compliant because it failed to provide details, as required, of the method statement and it also failed to provide the necessary health and safety information.

The lowest bidder was asked on two occasions to submit the missing information and they failed to do so.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1315 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND MAGAZINE**

Can Government confirm whether the tender documents in respect of Grand Magazine stipulated that buildings erected on that site should not exceed ground plus three storeys?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The tender conditions were that the project should consist of a low rise residential development.

There were then planning guidelines that set out that the development should be restricted to four storeys.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1315 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say when the tender for the development of the Anchorage was awarded what was the maximum height that the successful tenderer was going to construct on that site, the number of storeys?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This is before my time but from what I recollect I believe that the four storeys guideline was actually observed in the submission.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm that adverts have appeared and the development has been marketed in terms of seven or eight storey apartments?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, that is correct. I believe that negotiations were held with the developers subsequent to that and there were buildings that were staggered, in other words, some seven, eight, nine floors and some which were low-rise in order to create a variety of heights amongst the different buildings in the development.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Were other tenderers given an opportunity to tender in terms of the changes that had taken place in the heights of the development projects?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The answer is no, we did not give the opportunity for others to consider but let me say that it is not uncommon for Government to negotiate with developers after the tender has been awarded when issues arise in respect of different peculiarities in respect of any tender. In respect of this tender a staggered rooftop, it says in the guidelines, that adds visual interest to the area and careful consideration will need to be given to the relationship between individual building heights and building layout. In fact, the protection also and the need for them to protect Grand Magazine, which is an important feature within that, therefore all these considerations needed to be taken into account and I remember negotiation taking place in order to be able to assess a commercially viable project for the area bearing in mind what I have just said.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The considerations the Minister has read out are two sentences from the planning guidelines, he has not read out the sentence immediately before that which says, 'the height of the building shall be restricted to a maximum of four storeys, variety in length and building heights' then it goes on to mention the staggered roof scape and all the rest of it. What Opposition Members cannot understand is how a condition which is laid out in the planning guidelines, I remember that tender went back to the days of the Hon Peter Montegriffo when he was in that post, and there was a problem particularly with the need to conserve the historical site in which the development is going to take place, can the Minister clarify why the conditions of the tender were altered after it was awarded to this particular developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

First of all the hon Member appears to be labouring under a misapprehension about the nature of tender processes. Certainly it would be wrong to allow one participant in a tender process to participate on a different basis to another participant, but once tenders have been submitted on the same basis and there is a winner, it is standard practice, it is not uncommon certainly, for the Government to negotiate with the winner. The winner is already the winner on the basis of the tender, now certainly what cannot be done is that one cannot negotiate with somebody who is not the winner in order to make him the winner at the expense of the real winner. But re-negotiating or negotiating with the winner of the tender is by no means uncommon practice. As I recall, the negotiations I think related to the costs of the premiums that

were submitted as part of the bid were not sufficient to make the economic case given the expenses that had to be incurred by the Government in relocating all the various people that were in occupation of that site. That was the context in which the negotiation took place to extract a higher premium in order to ensure that at least the cost of the relocations were met. Of course, as developers always do, they said the only way they could sustain a higher premium is if they could build more sellable square metres and that is the context of the height increases. If what I have told the hon Member is wrong I will correct it at a later date with him but I am almost certain that the reason related to the fact that the premium was not sufficient to cover the cost of relocating the North Depot, the South Depot, the Buildings and Works, the RSPCA, the RGP garage and all those things.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the Government knew what it would cost to relocate all those things when they went out to tender, did they not indicate to prospective tenderers that there was a floor below which the Government would lose money on the operation instead of making money?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At the time of going to tender one does not know what bids one is going to get.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but if the land had people in it unless the people who were bidding were the ones already in it, if the bid came from somebody else it must follow inevitably that the person that was there had to be relocated by the Government. The Government went out to tender presumably with vacant possession of the site and invited proposals for a site that would be made available to a developer without tenants, or was it not like that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not recall.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It would be very peculiar, given that we are talking about what is common and not common, it would certainly not be common for somebody to apply to develop something where there is already somebody sitting there doing something else without it being taken for granted, at the very least if it was not spelt out, that the Government would be handing this site without people sitting there.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Or would relocate subsequently.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question therefore is, did the Government not already know what it would cost to relocate when they went to tender and therefore had already an idea of what they would be expecting to get from a developer to cover their relocation costs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I do not know whether people had done an assessment of the relocation costs but whether they had or they had not, and I do not know the answer to that, my recollection is that the bids that came in did not sustain those costs. Whether by then they had been established or it only became clear afterwards I could not tell him, but certainly my recollection is that the Government did not specify in the tender, 'by the way the relocation costs are £x million and therefore no bids under that figure will be entertained'. That certainly did not happen.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact, if the discussions with the successful tenderer, the winner, was on the basis that although he had won he was not offering enough then presumably it is not quite the same as saying, 'well look, we will negotiate with somebody that we would rather have one building higher and another one lower simply because it will look prettier'. I think we have been given two slightly different versions here because I think the hon Member's colleague said that in looking at this it was so as to produce a balance of what the buildings would look like and that that meant some going higher and some coming lower from the four.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The renegotiation with the tenderer was not motivated or caused by the fact that somebody thought it would be prettier if some of the buildings were higher and some lower. Somebody might well have thought that but that certainly was not the reason why there was a negotiation with the winner. Now the guidelines may have entertained that possibility but that still was not the reason why it was done.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, the answer to the original supplementary that it meant some buildings going up instead of all being uniform does not follow because nothing came down. That is to say, nothing went down below four storeys to make up for something going up higher because in fact what we are talking about is greater density. Not the same number of flats but a greater number.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, there was certainly a greater number of flats, whether it was achieved by leaving everything at the same height and increasing some, or by increasing some and lowering others I do not know. Certainly the net effect was a higher number of sellable square metres.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government have readily available what was the original number anticipated and what was the final number agreed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That information is of course available but I do not have it here.

ORAL

NO. 1316 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GOVERNMENT UK WEBSITE**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the relaunch of the Gibraltar Government UK website?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1266 to 1273 and 1317 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1317 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GOVERNMENT UK WEBSITE**

On what date did the production of a new Government UK website go out to tender?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1317 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1266**

There were no costs of the UKGTA meeting which was held on the same day as the Gibraltar Day in London.

**Answer to Question 1267**

The information requested in respect of this event is not yet available.

**Answer to Question 1268**

Three persons made up the official Gibraltar delegation to the Intur tourism fair in November as follows:

Nicky Guerrero, Sales & Marketing Manager  
Peter Kirkby, Sales Executive, GTB Office Madrid  
Gillaine De Los Santos, Administration Officer, GTB Office Madrid

**Answer to Question 1269**

Twelve journalists attended the informal gathering on 24 November 2005.

**Answer to Question 1270**

The GTB delegation consisted of five persons as follows:

Peter Canessa, Chief Executive, Gibraltar Tourist Board  
Nicky Guerrero, Sales & Marketing Manager, Gibraltar Tourist Board  
Ian Leyde, UK Sales Manager, Gibraltar Government Office in London  
Katie Cload, Executive Officer, Gibraltar Government Office in London  
Lucy Frost, Marketing Manager, Gibraltar Government Office in London

**Answer to Question 1271**

The cost of the Bristol roadshow, with a breakdown, was as follows:

Hire of room and hospitality	£6,660
Hire of powerpoint equipment, plasma TVs etc	£1,236
Printing and postage	£ 890
Accommodation costs	£1,098
Air fares	£1,711
Subsistence	£ 307
Travel expenses	£ 176

**Answer to Question 1272**

No policy decision has yet been taken with regard to Gibraltar's possible participation in the 2006 World Travel Market.

cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 1317**

**Answer to Question 1273**

There was no cost of the UKGTA brochure launch, which took place on the same day as the last UKGTA meeting.

The cost of the brochure was £32,285 of which Government paid £18,833. The balance was paid by industry participants in the brochure.

**Answer to Question 1316**

The cost of designing, producing and launching a new Gibraltar Government UK website was £17,567. This included all work on the database, new domain names and hosting.

**Answer to Question 1317**

The website project was put out to selective tender on 24 January 2005.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1266 TO 1273, 1316 AND 1317 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1269, the 12 journalists who attended the meeting at the INTUR Tourism Fair, does he have the list of the media that they represented?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not have the information here available but definitely we do have a list of those that did attend the informal gathering.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Could the Minister supply that in writing?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I will send it to him.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1271, the Road Show in Bristol, there is one entry which cost £6,660 and that was the hire of the room and hospitality, does the Minister know how much was the hire of the room and how much was the actual hospitality?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The hire of the room was £3,030 and the balance was in respect of the dinner and some pre-dinner drinks that were offered during the exhibition.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1272, the Minister says that no policy decision has been taken with regard to Gibraltar's possible participation in the World Travel Market next year. Is the matter currently under discussion to arrive at a change of policy or is it that the Government will not be participating?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the policy is still currently under review. It is normal at this time of the year, in fact for example, last year at the UKGTA meeting members were advised to give their views, not particularly on this issue but on general marketing activities and strategies and to submit this to me by 14<sup>th</sup> December. The same will happen next week at the meeting of the Tourism Advisory Council where advertising and marketing for the next financial year will be considered, and I think once all the relevant input is submitted by the various parties that tend to influence policy, then a

decision will be taken in line as well with the Estimates and general budget available for marketing. Then we will prioritise what activities we undertake and what we do not and at that point we will normally know this possibly towards the beginning of March time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is this discussion or this review something which normally happens in the normal course of events every year or is this something which is happening because of the World Travel Market only?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, it is the normal course of events that I adopt in the different areas for which I hold responsibility in order to allow the different sectors to be able to input into general Government policy. At the end of the day it is just input, it may not be that we decide to go down a different route altogether but I can say that generally consensus of the UKGTA is that we should not be there, and it is probably most in their interest if anything. I do not always share that view and I think I have made it known in public, but I bow down to those that are in the industry, those that are on the spot and at the end of the day they are probably the ones to benefit most from a successful attendance at World Travel Market. So in the last two years we have decided not to attend, it may change for the future.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1273, which is the UKGTA travel brochure, the brochure cost £32,000 of which the Government paid £18,833, is this a brochure that is usually put out to tender, the printing and production of it, how does this come about?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, in the UK it is not possible to go out to tender as we would do in Gibraltar. There is no way that we can put an advert in The Times or whatever for something like this, it just would not attract any attention whatsoever and it would be a very expensive way to go about advertising the tender. What we do is that we go out to selective tender which means that we go out to at least three or four parties who are given a brief and they are then told to submit proposals, not just on costing but on ways of undertaking the project forward, and then a selection is made. That is how it has been done in this particular year as has been done now for a few years.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The next question I had was in relation to the Government website cost of £17,500. The procedure used for that was the same as for the brochure?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, that is the procedure we follow.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the website is that not something which could have been done by a local company or local expertise, given that it is internet and it really does not matter where one is in order to produce it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well that may have been the case but the idea is that whoever has to coordinate the project has to be in the UK, because it needs to link up with all the participants, all the tour operators, all the various players that operate within that industry and then it needs to be kept up, contact has to be kept on establishments. I know all this can be done through the internet nowadays but I think that there is an element of personal involvement that would make it more feasible perhaps for somebody with real presence. Let me say, and this is not a determining factor, but let me say that one of the companies that actually got the contract had one of its senior executives being a Gibraltarian, but that is actually more by coincidence than by actual choice of determining who would get the tender or not, but he helped in the understanding of the product which I think was important.

**NO. 1318 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties that have applied for:

- (a) EU funding; or
- (b) Gibraltar Government funding;

since the last Question-Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purposes for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful, and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1318 of 2005****(a) Applications for EU Funding**

<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Funding Requested</b>		<b>Purpose of Grant</b>
		<b>ERDF</b>	<b>GOG</b>	
Dabutti Limited	Active	£2,185.80 (15%)	£2,185.80 (15%)	Renovation, office furniture, IT infrastructure and rent
Rysar Limited	Active	£2,571.00 (15%)	£2,571.00 (15%)	Website development, trade advertising, web marketing, database creation and management, merchant services, e-commerce fulfilment at e-commerce house and e-commerce house premises
Food & Beverages Management Ltd	Active	£4,935.60 (15%)	£4,935.60 (15%)	Building & renovation works, purchase of health and safety equipment, purchase of catering equipment, purchase of restaurant furniture

**(b) Applications for Government Funding**

<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Funding Requested</b>		<b>Purpose of Grant</b>
		<b>Costs</b>	
Threshold Counselling Services	Newly submitted	To be confirmed	To set up a therapy and counselling service

ORAL

NO. 1319 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**KONVER PROGRAMME**

Has the final payment of over £500,000 in respect of the Konver programme now been made and if not when do the Government expect to receive this amount?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS

The final payment of the Konver II Programme has yet not been received. The payment is still pending the UK's final Programme report being ratified by the EU Commission. No timescale has been given by either the UK or the EU Commission.

**NO. 1320 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**POSTAL SERVICES**

Can Government state of the £100,000 forecast outturn for 2004/2005 under postal services miscellaneous receipts how much was due to e-Commerce sales?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

The estimated revenue from e-Commerce was £90,000. The actual revenue was £79,399.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1320 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

These e-Commerce sales are what? Sales by the Post Office of philatelic material or something like that or is the fact that it is under the Post Office anything to do with the sale of stamps or nothing?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the services are run by the Post Office and basically what they do is store goods and ship them out, post them out on instructions from the e-Commerce operator.

ORAL

**NO. 1321 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored in Gibraltar since the last Question-Time in this House, showing the dates when the conferences in question were held, the cost and the department that was most directly involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT AND  
COMMUNICATIONS**

There have been none.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1322 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

Can Government state whether the Youth Services have been consulted in relation to the facilities that will be made available in the King’s Bastion Leisure Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1323 to 1326 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1323 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

Can Government state whether the Department of Education has been consulted in relation to the facilities that will be made available in the King’s Bastion Leisure Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1322 and 1324 to 1326 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1324 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

Can Government state whether any other Government Department has been consulted in relation to the facilities that will be made available in the King's Bastion Leisure Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1322, 1323, 1325 and 1326 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1325 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

On what date was a licence issued under the Heritage Trust Ordinance for the occupation of King’s Bastion by the developer and the contractors and to whom was such a licence issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1322 to 1324 and 1326 of 2005.

**NO. 1326 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

What is the value attached to the cost of the demolition of King’s Bastion power station provided in the agreement between the Government and the developers of the Mid-Town project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government will make an announcement about the Leisure Centre shortly. This is a leisure project and is therefore within the domain of the Ministry for Sports and Leisure.

The King’s Bastion is in the occupation of the Government as it has always been. The Government are the Developer of the Leisure Centre at King’s Bastion. The Contractor and his sub-contractors currently have access to the site only for the purposes of demolition and design.

The King’s Bastion is listed in Schedule 1 of the Gibraltar Heritage Trust Ordinance. The demolition has been carried out in close consultation with the Heritage Trust and pursuant to an inventory of structures to be demolished approved by the Trust. Obviously, no structure that forms part of the historical King’s Bastion has, or will be, demolished or even damaged. Indeed, the demolition of all these structures restores the Bastion to its historical, heritage form.

The design of the Leisure Centre itself has also been and will continue to be the subject of detailed consultation with the Trust.

The Government expect that such licence as may be required under section 39 of the Heritage Trust Ordinance will be issued at the appropriate time. As I have said already, the Developer are the Government and it remains to be determined whether the Government require such a licence since they would be licensing themselves.

The developer’s premium for the Mid-Town project requires it to pay £5.5 million towards the cost of the Leisure Centre. The cost of the demolition, which is on-going, is about £900,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1322 TO 1326 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to the three questions I have asked, as in consulting different departments of Government, can the Chief Minister give us an indication whether he has done so or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member will forgive me if we answer questions as we choose. The first sentence I read was the answer to his questions and that is that the Government will make an announcement about the Leisure Centre shortly. This is a leisure project and is therefore within the domain of the Ministry for Sports and Leisure.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government confirm whether the £900,000 is actually part of the £5.5 million the developer will therefore have £4.1 million left?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It will be, it is not yet. In other words, the Government have actually paid that but it will form part of the £5.5 million when all the documentation takes place. As a matter of cash flow the Government have paid it out, have advanced it out to the demolition contractor. So if the Government pay for this the developer have to pay the next £5.5 million of the project.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the demolition contractor is actually working directly for the Government and not for the developer of the site, the adjoining site as it were?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The demolition contractor is working under the auspices of the main contractor. The main contractor is not the Government, the Government is the developer. The demolition contractor is not in contract directly with the Government. The project costs more than £5.5 million so the Government will have to put additional funds, either at this stage or at a later stage, for the difference between the cost of the project and the £5.5 million which is the developer of the Mid-Town project's contribution to the Leisure Centre, as well as other things.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So there is now a main contractor that was appointed by who the Government or by the developer of the adjoining site? The one that is supposed to be providing the £5.5 million appointed the contractor or the Government appointed them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They did.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is that main contractor that gets paid by the Government who then pay the sub-contractor. Who are Government making the payments to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the Government are making the payments to the main contractor. Not to be confused with building contractor. There will be a building contractor as well but this project is not yet at the building phase. There is a contractor to the Government to build on behalf of the Government, who are the developer, a leisure centre. That contractor is the developer of the Mid-Town project. That developer of the Mid-Town project then engages architects, demolition contractors and in due course building contractors.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, the developer of the Mid-Town project that got the Mid-Town project on the basis that they would do things for the Government free of charge, are actually the ones that are being paid by the Government the £900,000?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The contract was not that they would do things free of charge, they would do some things free of charge to a certain value. The Government have chosen, in the context of the Leisure Centre bit of the package, remember that there is a school and other bits of the package as well, in respect of the Leisure Centre bit of the package the Government decided they wanted a leisure centre which was bigger and had more things in it than could be delivered for the element of the premium that had been earmarked for the leisure centre. So the Government said fine if we want more then we will pay for the difference. We could have had a £5.5 million leisure centre, it would have been smaller and had less things in it, and then they would have paid the lot.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If they were paying up front as it were, like they would do with the premium, £5.5 million worth of work why is it that the Government are having to do not the additional cost over and above the £5.5 million but the starting cost of the whole thing, which is what they offered in their proposal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I said, I thought I had said or intimated that it is early days because the documentation is not yet in place and they do not want to be shelling out large sums

of money for transactions that are not yet in place. I think it is funding issues with the bank, so as not to delay the demolition we have put the money in, they have got to pay in £5.5 million and we have got to put in the balance. Whether we put in a bit at the beginning or a bit at the end or a bit in the middle is neither here nor there. We could have waited until everything is documented but then the demolition would not yet have started.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to come back to the question of the licence under the Heritage Ordinance, if I understood the Chief Minister correctly the Government, he said, are the developer so it remains to be determined whether the Government as the developer requires such a licence or not. What about the contractor, does the contractor have such a licence under the Heritage Ordinance?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the person who would require a licence is somebody to go in to do a development there. Now if the hon Member put in a bid to the Government to do a development in the King's Bastion, he would need a licence. Everybody that works then for the developer would not need a licence, the contractor, the electricians, the plumber, it is the developer that needs a licence to access the site and do whatever he is permitted to do under the terms of the licence. It has not yet been legally decided whether the Government need such a licence, since as I said before they would be licensing themselves. I have a personal view on the matter but at the end of the day it remains to be seen whether I am right or wrong. The correct reading of the Ordinance is not that everybody that goes in there needs a licence, the licence is needed by the principal party that gets permission to build or develop or to alter and things like that. The contractor, for example in the context of planning permission or building permission, the contractor does not get planning permission. Planning permission is obtained by the developer of a project, in other words, the party on whose behalf a project is being built.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Then am I correct in assuming that as the Chief Minister sees it, the words "to occupy any part of the building, structure, site or land" are words which he would argue apply to the developer and not to the contractor? Would the contractor need a licence to occupy, that is the question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In my view no, but it remains to be determined. I think the Government are in occupation of the King's Bastion as they have always been. If we were to put it out to tender and allow a private developer access, then that private developer would certainly require a licence.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So if a contractor moves in with machinery, bulldozers or whatever equipment they need and it is a contractor doing it on behalf of the Government, then the Government's contention is that they would not need the licence. Secondly, can I just clarify when he says this needs to be determined or needs to be legally determined, is this before a court or something of that nature?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not before a court.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Some time ago when the issue of whether or not this particular development should have gone out to tender, I recall the Chief Minister saying that it was not going out to tender because the proposal made to the Government was so exactly what the Government wanted that they felt no need to tender or to go out to tender. Is it that it was not so exactly what the Government wanted for that site, because we are now being told the Government will not accept a £5.5 million leisure centre, they actually want to do something better and therefore that another tenderer might have been able to propose that to the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member cannot resist the temptation to construct his own words in order then to justify the point that he wants to make on the back of them. I have never said that it was so exactly what the Government wanted that the Government felt, the Government said that there is an exception to their policy of putting things out to tender and that is when there is an exceptional, economic or social benefit to Gibraltar, and that this was a case in which the Government felt that the social benefits to Gibraltar justified it in the form of not just a leisure centre but also the underground parking, the park, the school, all of which would be presented. We have only been discussing, in the context of the leisure centre, one slice of that premium, there are other bits but of course each slice had a monetary value attached to it. It is not a question of the developer saying, 'well I will build you a leisure centre, a school, a park and underground car park' without saying how many floors of the underground car park, how big is the school or how expensive is the leisure centre. I think the hon Member I am sure envisages that there is a cash sum attributed to these things and the amount that was pencilled in for the leisure centre in the event did not deliver the sort of leisure centre that we wanted. We could have had a £5.5 million leisure centre but we thought it would be a wasted opportunity and that with a little bit of Government extra investment it could be made much better.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just come back to the question of the licence just to clarify it or to seek information? Can the Minister say whether the Government or whether advice has been sought from the Attorney General on this point as to whether a licence is required under the Heritage Ordinance?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not disclose whether or from whom they may seek advice on legal issues.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Government publish every year in the Estimates of Expenditure not only from whom they seek legal advice but actually how much they pay for that legal advice. I am simply asking in this case whether advice has been sought from the Attorney General or not. Given the Chief Minister's words were that it remains to be determined whether such a licence is required, that is what has opened up the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It remains to be determined is a very different question of whether who we may have sought advice from or not sought advice from. The Government will determine this on the basis of a device if they feel it appropriate to seek it from whatever party they consider it appropriate to seek it from. But when we do seek that advice, it is not normal to give details of the advice that the Government receive. The Attorney General is the Government's in-house legal adviser, there are occasions in which the Government take advice from him and then also take advice from people in the private sector, there are occasions in which they take advice only from people in the private sector and there are occasions when they take advice only from him.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

It is not that we want details of the advice, it is simply to know whether the point has been referred to anyone for advice.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The point has not yet been determined, I am not willing to go beyond that. My own personal view is that if a piece of legislation says that somebody needs a licence from the Government, and the person doing the things that needs the licence is also the Government, it is pretty odd that the Government should be licensing themselves. Of course I suppose it is possible to give oneself a piece of paper that gives permission to do something but it is all pretty academic stuff.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1327 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**WATERPORT HOUSING PROJECT**

What costs if any were incurred by GRPI Company Limited in connection with the Waterport Housing Scheme in the financial years 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1328 and 1329 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1328 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**WATERPORT HOUSING PROJECT**

Can Government confirm whether the fee of £3.1 million payable to the design team appointed for the housing development at the Waterport is reflected in the cost at which the properties have been put on sale?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1327 and 1329 of 2005.

**NO. 1329 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**WATERPORT HOUSING PROJECT**

Are there any additional costs other than the price of tender award to the construction company and the design team fees reflected in the overall costs of the housing project at the Waterport and if so which and what is the total cost of the project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Costs incurred by GRP Co Ltd were nil in 2002/2003, £92,357 in 2003/2004 and £1,489,772 in 2004/2005.

The £3.1 million in fees relates, and it may be that I did not make this clear when I last answered a question on this subject from him, to the design and contract administration of four projects. The portion of the fee related to the residential properties for sale at Waterport Terraces is £1.8 million and this is included as part of the projected costs, and therefore reflected in the sale price of the properties. That is the £1.8 million and not the £3.1 million.

The sale prices reflect all foreseeable costs that GRP and the Government will incur in relation to this project until sale of the properties to the purchasers. Some of these costs cannot be ascertained until completion and are therefore estimated. It is not appropriate to provide details of them at this stage, but Government will be happy to publish a full account of the development when it is completed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1327 TO 1329 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The tender award of the £50 million and the £3.1 million is at the moment the ones that are in the public domain and quantified, anything above that at this stage are estimates which the Government do not know whether the estimate is going to be too high or too low?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, what we actually expect to happen is that some of them will come in higher, some of them will come in lower, but I think we would be very lucky to get away with the total amount that we have provided for and which we have used as the basis for

the sale price calculations, very lucky indeed because with these sorts of contracts unforeseen costs always crawl out of the woodwork. Let me put it this way, I think it is most improbable that it should transpire at the end of the day that we have used a figure that is too high a base price for calculating sale price. Much more likely to be the opposite but in fact we have sold for less than cost. Some of these costs may be higher. The total costs may be higher.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But the money that has been spent by GRPI to date is all part of the £3.1 million or the £50 million or is it paying for any of these other things out of that money?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I could not tell him for certain, it may have paid for some of its own marketing expenses and things of that sort, but I cannot think of any of the other items that have been incurred yet, or other things like infrastructure costs and things of that sort.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1330 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**SOUTH DISTRICT HOUSING PROJECT**

Can Government state what provisions have or will be made within the south district to cater for the inevitable demographic move of people after the announced building projects are completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1331 of 2005.

**NO. 1331 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**SOUTH DISTRICT HOUSING PROJECT**

Can Government state what education impact study has been conducted by the Department of Education as to the implications of the demographic move of people to the south district in the near future?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are satisfied that these developments will not disrupt the provision of any public service or amenity any more than it did when the much larger demographic move occurred at the time of the larger Westside developments.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1330 AND 1331 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So if I take that the criticisms from the GSD at the time that nothing was made, the Chief Minister is now making the same mistake by not doing anything at all, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not correct but certainly if we were replicating the mistake it would be on a smaller scale since Westside was much larger, many more houses, much more demographic movement went into the Westside areas than these projects in the south district. As I say, the Government are satisfied that none of the public services or amenities will be disrupted, and that includes the educational ones, the sewage, the traffic and everything else that has been erected by those who would much rather not see this development happen.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Chief Minister know how many more children might go into St Joseph's School?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not possible to know that until we have the list of purchasers and therefore know how many of them were living in the south district already and might already be going to St Joseph's School. Certainly the hon Member should be aware that if one has a first and a middle school in the south district, when that school has finished educating the children of the first wave of residents into the south district, for example, Brympton and Vineyards and Rosia Dale, unless one puts in new young married couples with young children, St Joseph's School will very quickly become surplus to requirements, because the children that have been going to St Joseph's First and Middle Schools for the last few years will not stay at St Joseph's First and Middle Schools for long, they progress to the Comprehensive. So perhaps we ought to be building more in the south district to make sure the excellent first and middle schools which the hon Members developed when they were in Government does not go to waste.

**NO. 1332 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether the value of the property where the Theatre Royal was situated has increased since they signed the agreement with the owners?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This site is earmarked for a theatre and therefore has no value other than as a site for a theatre. There is no market in Gibraltar for theatre sites and it is therefore not possible to gauge whether its value has increased or not.

Were the site not earmarked as it is for a theatre, and were it available, which it is not, for other types of development, I imagine that its value will have increased.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1332 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I say this because he was the one that stated that this property was valued at £1.3 million for the sale to the Government itself, so it was the Government who were interested in buying the theatre and the value he gave at the time was £1.3 million reviewable every three years. I think it is a reasonable question to ask whether the owner had now reviewed the value for the sale of a theatre, or a hole, a crater in the middle of town which is what is left, to more than £1.3 million which he said in this House. This is the question, so a sarcastic answer that the Chief Minister is trying to give is not good enough. So can he tell me whether the owners have actually increased the value which he stated in this House, which was £1.3 million, or have not it is a simple question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It may be a simple question and indeed as he says it may be a reasonable question but it is not the question he asked on the Order Paper. He did not ask me in the Order Paper whether the owners had revalued the property, he asked me whether the value of the property has increased.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Since the owners signed, can he not carry on reading?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Since they signed the agreement with the owners. That is only fixing in time, whether something has increased in value or not is a product of the market, it is not a product of what the owners think or even what I think. In any event, presumably he recalls that what was to be revalued was the rent and not the strike price of the option. If he wants to know whether the owners have said whether they think the property is worth more now than it was three years ago, he should have asked that question. That is not the question that he has asked. The question that he has asked is whether the value of the property, not the price, but whether the value of the site has increased since we signed the agreement with the owners. Now that is the answer that he has got and it is the right answer, he is not getting another one.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Has the price increased then? I will ask the Chief Minister the question that he wants asked in the manner he wants it asked.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If he means were the Government to exercise their option to purchase the property under the original deal, has the formula for the calculation of the price increased beyond that which he is aware of, the answer is no.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just to put on record, 'aware of' comes from himself in this House, £1.3 million.

**NO. 1333 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – TEACHERS PENSIONS**

Can Government state whether they have reformed the pension scheme to ensure that teachers receive recognition for all the periods of service in the computation of their pensions and therefore disregarding any break in service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As the hon Member knows it is a manifesto commitment of this Government to reverse the historical position in the public service, not reversed by previous Governments, whereby the pre-break in service periods of service are disregarded from calculation of occupational pension entitlement. This policy will be implemented, I am confident next year, but it is not limited to teachers.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1334 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**WATERPORT HOUSING PROJECT**

Can Government now state, of the 1112 applications received by the closing date for the purchase of Waterport Terraces, how many were from applicants on the pre-list for housing and how many were from applicants on the housing waiting list proper?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government cannot yet provide that information, it is being calculated as we speak.

**NO. 1335 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOUTH DISTRICT HOUSING PROJECT**

Can Government state what is the meaning of the phrase "Established residents of Gibraltar" which appeared in their Press Release 239/2005 dated 12 October 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The exact eligibility criteria for the South District developments has not been settled yet and awaits analysis of the applications for Waterport Terraces. But the phrase 'established residents of Gibraltar' means what it says – residents who are established. What remains to be decided is the exact parameters of how it will be fixed. In other words, the definition of what the parameters are going to be for fixing the concept of established. But it will extend to categories of people who are not Gibraltarians under the Gibraltarian Status Ordinance and will extend to established UK Nationals.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1335 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Will this include Moroccans?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have said what I have said, I cannot say more than what I have said which is not to say that anything more is written in or written out. It is just that this is so far as the decisions have gone pro tem.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

There is no reference then to persons having to be eligible for Government housing, which I think was the criteria that was being used previously, this is a different approach.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I think it is likely to be different and of course a distinction has to be drawn between eligibility to buy and eligibility to take part in any co-ownership scheme that the Government may design, they are different things. This is a private development and therefore, as opposed to Waterport Terraces which was a development carried out by the Government using public funds, this is a private development done by a developer using private funds. The Government's interest is in the co-ownership scheme and in the resale prices given that there is an element of interest in terms of the way the sites were allocated and the value attached to the sites, which I think themselves contain an element of subsidy. So a distinction has to be drawn between the eligibility to purchase and the eligibility to participate in any 50/50 scheme, but I should say that the 50/50 scheme for these projects have not been designed or thought about yet. Well they have been thought about but they have not been settled in detail.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, the phrase 'established residents of Gibraltar' at this stage is about eligibility to purchase and does not imply anything more than that, just eligibility to purchase at this point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That does not tell him anything about what it will mean in the context of the co-ownership scheme. He should not assume from that question that the co-ownership scheme will be limited to registered Gibraltarians. He should not assume it, it may or it may not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I cannot assume either one or the other, then presumably I will have to get told when the decision is taken whether it is one or the other.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I just did not want him going away with the wrong impression. That which he says just now is implicit in my earlier statement that the decision has not yet been made.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have taken on board the fact that he has said that. All I am saying is that since this is in fact something published by the Government in a Government press release, then the position at the moment is that people who see themselves, or think they are or may perceive themselves as established residents, at the moment are being told that that potentially qualifies them to buy into these projects but not necessarily to be eligible for any further treatment. It may or may not but at the moment it is only in respect of being able to buy, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but that statement is true of established UK residents as indeed of established Gibraltarians. The Government have not yet made any statement about the nature of the home ownership scheme that will be available for this project for anybody, for the UK, for Gibraltarians or for anybody else. So he should not read into the co-ownership scheme aspects of our discussion, anything specific to UK or to British non-Gibraltarians. Government have said nothing about the co-ownership scheme attaching to this project in favour of anybody, Gibraltarians, Moroccans, British non-Gibraltarians or any other category of person. I am just being cautious to make sure that he does not read more than that into our exchanges. For example, what he has just said that in respect of purchase, established UK nationals are safe but that they are not safe in respect of home ownership. Nobody is safe in respect of home ownership because the Government have said nothing about home ownership for anybody yet in these schemes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not suggesting that Government have, I know that Government have not, I am saying that if the Government issue a press release and refer to a category of persons who are established residents of Gibraltar being able to do something, to buy, then the established residents of Gibraltar means that the seller can only sell to somebody that meets that definition. What we have heard from the Government really is that at this stage the definition is intended to be established UK nationals but may mean more than established UK nationals at some.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In other words, it is not limited only to Gibraltarians.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If we are talking about a private development which is being put on the market, are the Government in a position, other than by virtue of the agreement that is done with the developer, to stop an EU national that comes into Gibraltar from buying?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government are neither in a position nor would wish to do so, these are all subjects of agreement with the developer. The developer, who I suppose will honour the agreement, much as happened in the time of his own affordable housing schemes in Westside when there were agreements as to eligibility of purchaser. The extent to which it is legally enforceable is nothing that has ever been tested, but I think the developer expects to comply with his agreement with the Government and we expect that too.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is why in one of my previous supplementaries I asked because in the past the eligibility test was that one was eligible to purchase if one was eligible to be rehoused



by the Government. That is not the case this time. The categories of people who would not be able to apply for Government housing, who would not be entitled to make an application, would still be entitled to buy.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. Let me put it another way, the categories of people who are entitled to apply for Government housing is narrower than the category of persons who will be eligible to buy in these developments.

**NO. 1336 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**CHILTON COURT**

Can Government confirm when is the handover date for the flats at Chilton Court and whether the flats would be immediately available to the Housing Department for persons on the waiting list when they are handed over or would refurbishment work need to be carried out before they are ready?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The date specified in the lands agreement for handover of the flats at Chilton Court is March next year. This is not a firm date for two reasons. Firstly, the law Courts are considering cases of irregular MOD occupants, the verdict on which may have implications for this date. Secondly, the MOD is at present reviewing housing policy for serving members of the Royal Gibraltar Regiment. The outcome of this review could also impact on this date. The Government will wish to adopt the position which is most helpful to and supportive of the most favourable outcome of that review for the benefit of Royal Gibraltar Regiment soldiers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1336 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the position then that on the basis of these factors there is a possibility that the March 2006 date will not be met?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think there is a very strong possibility of that, yes, of it not being met. In fact there are circumstances in which it may not happen at all.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

What the handover may not happen at all?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are circumstances in which it may not happen at all, and I am being as cryptically informative as I can in the original answer to the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, we have noticed a certain crypticness in the answer, but the second part seems to suggest that there may be a possibility of Chilton Court then being used to a greater extent to house Gibraltar Regiment people, and that is something which the Government are supportive of and I think we would be supportive of that as well. Is that the indication?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

All that he has said is true but not exactly, I think the MOD is reviewing its housing policy and if, for example, that review were to conclude, as I think we would both hope that it did, that the Royal Gibraltar Regiment has the same housing rights as any other soldiers in the British Army, I think that would be something that we would all support on both sides of this House and I think would be a right and fair decision. But if that was the conclusion, then it might alter some of the dynamics which enable the MOD to make this particular block available.

**NO. 1337 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government now say if they are in a position to state to whom and at what price were each of the thirteen pre-war dwellings offered for tender in the upper town area sold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The completion date was set as 2<sup>nd</sup> December and by this date eight out of the twelve have completed the purchase of their property. Government will shortly be publishing the usual notice in the Gazette setting out the details of these awards. In the meantime, I am quite happy to have the hon Member have a copy in confidence for his information but I would prefer not to make the information available public, it rather makes a waste of time of the notice in the Gazette. So I will hand him in a while, but not in answer to the question for the purposes of Hansard, the information. It will be published in the Gazette.

The four properties where the purchase was not completed will now be offered to the next preferred bidder for each of the individual properties concerned. I cannot give him a date of when that is likely to complete. I am quite happy to send it to him now provided it is not for inclusion in Hansard. The paper I am handing him also has the names of the people that did not compete and withdrew that information is confidential even after the other has been published.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1337 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The Chief Minister is referring now to 12 properties because we started off with 14 in October according to the March press release. Apparently the explanation was a simple one that in fact two addresses had been put in as one, so that brought the number from 14 to 13. Now I think he is talking about 12 properties.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I am straining my memory now but I think there was a possibility that one property might have been bid for as two separate dwellings and in fact it was bid for as one large one. Therefore it is one rather than two. He can compare those

addresses with the pictures in the advertisement in the Chronicle and he will be able to see how those were all allocated.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1338 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government confirm what was the original target date set for the completion of the sale of the properties at Rosia Court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1339 to 1344 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1339 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government say how many prospective purchasers of Rosia Court have completed their purchase as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1338 and 1340 to 1344 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1340 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government state whether there is any delay in completing the sale of the properties at Rosia Court and if so explain why?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1338, 1339 and 1341 to 1344 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1341 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government confirm whether asbestos has been found in any of the properties at Rosia Court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1338 to 1340 and 1342 to 1344 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1342 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government confirm whether there have been problems reported with the water heaters at Rosia Court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1338 to 1341, 1343 and 1344 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1343 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government say how many properties at Rosia Court were damaged as a result of works on the properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1338 to 1342 and 1344 of 2005.

**NO. 1344 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ROSIA COURT**

Can Government say whether they will be subsidising the service charges for Rosia Court and if so in what amount and for what reason?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1338**

At the time of going to tender it was envisaged that allocation would take place on or about 6<sup>th</sup> May 2005 and completions were to take place six weeks after that. This was delayed, the hon Member will recall, for the reasons explained publicly on several occasions, so that bidders would know the selling prices at Waterport Terraces before committing themselves to Rosia Court. Some buyers, after allocation, then asked for Government to consider including the lofts in the sales. Those were not originally advertised for sale, the lofts, the void in between the pitched ceiling. Government agreed, but this required the Government to do some precautionary work on the roof which, like all such roofs, contain asbestos. The hon Member's use of the phrase 'asbestos being found' is unnecessarily dramatic, asbestos is to be found in almost all building materials in all buildings built within a certain period after the Second World War until about the 1970's. So it is not a question of asbestos being found, one can be almost certain that buildings of a certain age will contain asbestos. The question is where, is it tampered with, is it untampered with and are people likely to come into contact with it in a tampered form? As I say, because of the lofts the Government acceded to a request to include the lofts, which had not been originally envisaged, it has got asbestos sheeting basically, the roof consists of asbestos sheeting the Government in agreeing to include the lofts then thought it appropriate to do some health and safety work to make sure that these lofts, to which it was now to be envisaged that people might gain regular access, were safe. This further delayed completions. This work has now been completed and asbestos dust-free environment certificates have been issued by specialist contractors.

The Government are not aware of any problems with heaters. When Rosia Court was connected to the MOD water supply, the houses were fitted with gravity-fed boilers. When the estate was connected to the higher pressure AquaGib supply it was necessary to install new pressure fed boilers, which the Government did.

**Answer to Question No. 1343**

Any damages caused by the contractor will have been made good. The Government are not aware of how many properties required repairs as a result of contracted works being carried out.

**Answer to Question No. 1344**

As announced in the tender advert, GRP will provide a £33,000 start-up fund for the Management Company. This is intended to minimise the service charge due by the purchaser during the first years.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1345 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state if there has been any sale of the Government 50 per cent share of co-ownership homes during the months of October and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1346 of 2005.

**NO. 1346 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES - COMMISSION**

Can Government state whether the Treasury has charged a commission on property sales of the Government's share of co-ownership homes in the months of October 2005 and November 2005 and if so provide the dates, the amounts received and the estates where each of the relevant properties is located?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Two sales have taken place during October and November 2005. One flat was sold at Sir William Jackson Grove and another flat at Montagu Gardens. They attracted commissions of £3,783 and £3,725 respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1345 AND 1346 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At what price in terms of the increase over the original price are these being sold now? The Government announced a number of reduced levels on a number of different occasions with cut-off dates, are these covered by any of those or are they now back to the original 9 per cent of the market value or whatever is appropriate? What is the position now?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know, it is certainly not the original concessionary rates because that was closed but whether it has gone back, I think different ones may be at 9 per cent because there was a period of years which may not yet have been expired. Most of them should be there or thereabouts by now but I cannot tell him the regime under which these have been sold I am afraid. If he is interested I will let him know.

ORAL

**NO. 1347 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HOUSING – ROSIA TANKS**

Can Government say how the sites at Rosia Tanks and Cumberland Road came to be included in a tender for North Gorge and Buena Vista?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I understand from my hon Colleague Mr Holliday that this question was extensively debated this morning. I think he already knows the answer to that and there is nothing more that I can add.



ORAL

**NO. 1348 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies were registered in Gibraltar in each of the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1349 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1349 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the months of October 2005 to end November 2005 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

No Protected Cell Companies were registered in Gibraltar in each of the months of October to November 2005 and no applications have been submitted in those months.

ORAL

**NO. 1350 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1351 and 1352 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1351 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates have been issued in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1350 and 1352 of 2005.

**NO. 1352 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many companies have, since October 2005, applied to the office of the Finance Centre Director for the grant of exempt status and of these how many are presently awaiting the grant of said exempt status?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of 103 companies terminated the tax exempt status, 50 in October and 53 in November. "Terminated their tax exemption" is interpreted by the Finance Centre Director as companies which have returned their certificates and no longer require exempt status.

A total of 168 tax exempt certificates were issued in October and November 2005. Since October 2005 a total of 12 applications have been received requesting tax exempt status of which 10 have been registered and two are awaiting further consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1350 TO 1352 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister break down the figure of 168 as between October and November?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am afraid I cannot.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps the Chief Minister can tell us whether he knows of the 10 that have been granted in the period since October 2005, 12 applied but 10 were granted in that period, can he tell us whether any of those are going to result in the economic benefit test being satisfied? Namely, are they going to result in employment in the local labour market et cetera, or are they straightforward brass plate operations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him. The Government have now issued policy guidelines for the Finance Centre Director but we do not micro-manage, at least from my Ministerial level, I do not get detailed reports. I assume that the policy is being correctly applied, namely, that priority is given to the more economically relevant applicants.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1353 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1354 and 1355 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1354 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1353 and 1355 of 2005.



**NO. 1355 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many companies have been re-domiciled out of Gibraltar in each month from October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of 187 companies were removed from the register in October and 238 in November. During the same months, 124 and 154 respectively in each month were formed. A total of 32 companies were re-domiciled out in October and 54 in November.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1352 TO 1355 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the figure given for 'removed from the register' inclusive of the figure given for re-domiciliations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have no note here that enables me to say with certainty but it must do because the reason for removal is neither here nor there. They have either been removed or they have not. They could be removed by being wound up, they could be domiciled, they could be struck off, they all result in removal it would not be logical for the answer to be no.

Perhaps I do have a note that might shed some light and the answer may in fact be different to the one that I have given, logical or not. I have here a note that says 'unless a company has requested that its registration in Gibraltar be cancelled, it must during the period that it maintains domicile abroad, maintain a registered office in Gibraltar, file an annual return, record share transfers, allotment, increase in share capital, change of Directors, mortgages and satisfaction of mortgages'. So I suppose the answer to his question depends on whether they asked or did not ask for the registration to be cancelled. If they did not ask for the registration to be cancelled then actually logic suggests that they should not be included in the removed figure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Chief Minister have in his note how many of those that re-domiciled asked for their registration to be cancelled or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I have not but probably, this is something that Companies Registry could give him, but presumably all of them because when they re-domicile they re-domicile usually for property tax reasons. I can find that out for him if he wants.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1356 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1357 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1357 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet which I hand to him, except the breakdown by bank or company which it is not appropriate to give him.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1357/2005**

**Answer to Question 1356 and 1357**

**Banking and Insurance**

<b>Month</b>	<b>No. of Employers</b>	<b>No. of Employees</b>	<b>Gib</b>	<b>Other British</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Moroccan</b>	<b>Other EEC</b>	<b>Other Non- EEC</b>
October-05	46	945	628	197	48	2	61	9
November-05	46	930	626	196	36	2	61	9

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1356 AND 1357 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I note the Chief Minister has said that he would not give me a breakdown by bank or institution, I have not asked for one nor have I been used to getting one in this House when I have been asking this question regularly. What I have been used to getting is a different figure in respect of banking and insurance, whilst now I am getting a composite figure both in respect of banking and insurance, at least if he has given me the right piece of paper. For October I know a total number of employers, banks and insurance companies, and I know a total number of employees, banks and insurance companies. Previously the answer that has been provided in this House was for banking employees and banking institutions, insurance companies et cetera. Has he got that information perhaps in the extra material?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do, I cannot imagine why anyone has wanted to be so beastly to him as to aggregate the information. In fact he does ask for the information he claims not to have sought. In one question he says 'giving a breakdown by bank' and in another question he says 'giving a breakdown by company'. In respect of October for the banking industry it is 15 employers and 704 employees. For November it is 15 employers and 707 employees. In respect of insurance, in both cases it is 31 employers but it is 241 employees in October and 223 in November. The breakdown by nationality is very similar to the ones he may have had in the past, I can see historical figures here, it does not differ by more than one or two in any of the figures.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not have the Hansard with me to see the earlier answers provided in this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will give them to him quickly, take a note.

**Banking – October**

<b>Gibraltarians</b>	<b>Other British</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Moroccan</b>	<b>Other EEC</b>	<b>Other Non-EEC</b>
488	117	34	2	58	5

**November**

<b>Gibraltarians</b>	<b>Other British</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Moroccan</b>	<b>Other EEC</b>	<b>Other Non-EEC</b>
489	119	34	2	58	5

**Insurance – October**

<b>Gibraltarians</b>	<b>Other British</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Moroccan</b>	<b>Other EEC</b>	<b>Other Non-EEC</b>
140	80	14	0	3	4

**November**

<b>Gibraltarians</b>	<b>Other British</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Moroccan</b>	<b>Other EEC</b>	<b>Other Non-EEC</b>
137	77	2	0	3	4

ORAL

**NO. 1358 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new banking licences have been issued in the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1359 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1359 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELECTRONIC MONEY INSTITUTIONS**

Can Government state how many applications or licences to operate an electronic money institution have been received or granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No new banking licences have been issued in the months of October and November 2005.

No applications to operate an electronic money institution has been received and therefore no licences have been granted.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1360 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government state whether there are persons in Government Service, including Agencies and Authorities, as at 30 November 2005 who held a certificate under the Qualifying (Category 3) Individuals Rules and Qualifying (Category 4) Individual Rules, and if so, provide a breakdown by nationality, post occupied and department worked in?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1361, 1362 and 1363 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1361 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of each of the months of October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1360, 1362 and 1363 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1362 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status in Gibraltar in each month from October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1360, 1361 and 1363 of 2005.

**NO. 1363 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status in Gibraltar in each month from October to November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1360**

As at the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005, the following persons in Government service including Agencies and Authorities held a certificate under the Qualifying (Category 3) Individuals Rules. (There are no such persons holding a certificate in respect of the Qualifying (Category 4) Individuals Rules).

NAME	NATIONALITY	POST	DEPARTMENT
Mr D McCutcheon	Irish / Canadian	CEO	GHA *
Ms K Parsley	British (UK)	Director of Nursing Services	GHA *
Mr C Wilson	British (UK)	Director of Human Resources	GHA *
Mr J Tipping	British (GIB)	Finance Centre Director	Finance Centre Department *
Mr M Killick	British (UK)	Commissioner	FSC
Mr C Collins	British (UK)	Head of Insurance	FSC

For the purposes of the answer, the phrase 'held a certificate' is interpreted as either (i) a certificate has been issued; or (ii) a commitment exists on the part of Government to issue a certificate to cover the date in question – issue of the certificate is in progress – these commitments are marked with an asterisk.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1361, 1362 and 1363**

The following persons joined the register:

In October,	1 category 2	5 category 3	0 category 4
In November,	3 category 2	5 category 3	0 category 4

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1360 TO 1363 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are any of the individuals in respect of whom we have been provided details of Category 3, individuals who joined in any of the months in respect of which the answers have been given for October and November or were they there previously?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think they have all been in post for some time. I think they have all enjoyed that status for more than two months.

**NO. 1364 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SAVINGS DIRECTIVE**

Have Government now entered into any agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to the Savings Directive in particular and exchange of information generally?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No agreement has yet been signed or entered into, but we are at an advanced stage of negotiations.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1364 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister give us an indication of what that agreement will entail in respect of exchange of information and the Savings Directive issue, given that it is already fairly advanced?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it would be inappropriate to do so at this stage. I do not think it would be appropriate to speculate. We have consulted closely with the Gibraltar Bankers Association and I am sure that one of them will at least privately, and on condition he makes no public use of it, tell him. I do not mind telling him myself privately but I would not like to say on the record until the deal has been done.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The deal is in fact to treat each other as separate Member States, is that correct? That is the nature of the deal, I am not asking for the details.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not the nature of the deal but the directive does not apply as a matter of law and obligation because we are not separate Member States. So this is a bilateral agreement, it is not an extension of the directive.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Like all the other bilateral agreements where we grant each other EU rights, going back to 1973. It does not follow the pattern of the rest, that is the question that I am asking, is it something different or is it like all the others where the United Kingdom and Gibraltar agree to treat each other as if they were two separate Member States?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is not that simple and nor, although he does not appreciate it, is the question. Implicit in the fact that these arrangements will be in place is that we are treating each other as separate jurisdictions and administrations, but the arrangements that will apply between Gibraltar and the United Kingdom for example, will not be the same as the arrangements that apply between France and the United Kingdom. Therefore the choice of the words 'as if they were Member States' does not apply to the content.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1365 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CIVIL LEGAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government give a breakdown of the amounts paid to each law firm (or Barrister) in respect of civil legal assistance and criminal legal aid in each of the financial years 1999-2000, 2000-1, 2001-2 and 2002-3?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1366 to 1368 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1366 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LEGAL DRAFTING - FEES**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £50,000 Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005 Private Sector Fees for Legal Drafting shown in Head 8-A, Sub-Head 8(d) showing who the money was paid to, on what date and for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1365, 1367 and 1368 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1367 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LEGAL ADVICE - FEES**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £862,000 Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005 Private Sector Fees for Legal Advice shown in Head 8-A, Sub-Head 15, showing who the money was paid to, on what date and for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1365, 1366 and 1368 of 2005.

**NO. 1368 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CIVIL LEGAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government give a breakdown of the amounts paid so far in this financial year to each law firm (or Barrister) in respect of civil legal assistance and criminal legal aid, giving a breakdown by firm?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a table with the information requested. However, on reflection and in relation to Question No. 1367, the Government do not consider it appropriate to put in the public domain details of the issues upon which they take legal advice. This could, in certain cases, operate to the detriment of the interests of Gibraltar. I am, however, willing to provide those details to the hon Member privately and confidentially. If I just give a list of all the subject matters in respect of which we have taken legal advice, others will know that we have taken legal advice about those subjects and in the vast majority of cases there will be some items on the list which is useful information to others. In answer to Question No. 1367 it is the law firm, the date of payment of the amount but not the matter.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368**  
**Answer to Question 1365**

The breakdown of amounts paid to each law firm (or barrister) in respect of civil legal assistance and criminal legal aid is as follows:

Firm	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
	Legal Assistance	Legal Aid	Legal Assistance	Legal Aid	Legal Assistance	Legal Aid	Legal Assistance	Legal Aid
A Haynes	0.00		0.00	147.00	0.00	1960.00	0.00	4,037.50
Atlas & Levy	23,982.88	163.80	42,483.63	1,622.65	25,314.08	2,997.50	25,069.22	
B Vaughan	13,235.20	374.00	2,518.60	1,077.00	5,762.00	2,372.50	0.00	4,611.00
Budhrani & Co	0.00		0.00		0.00	465.00	1,601.80	5,820.80
C A Gomez & Co	17,705.64	557.20	14,367.07	512.00	6,074.61		11,801.35	
Cruz & Co		1,058.10		1,019.80		182.50		
D Hughes	7,940.44		0.00	101.00	0.00	280.00	0.00	
E C Ellul & Co	45,150.24	160.00	0.00		1,385.98		3,545.70	
Gold Law Firm	0.00		0.00	67.50	6,592.73	2,772.00	6,291.12	3,946.00
Hassans	21,716.66	102.00	8,022.00	703.00	31,349.56	4,553.00	4,304.00	18,745.95
Hayward Associates	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	1,815.45
HLB Perez Rodriguez				321.00		75.00		
Janis Evans	90,587.85		81,920.75		83,180.03		37,361.05	
Isola & Isola	0.00	75.00	0.00	2,968.00	0.00		0.00	3,537.50
Marrache & Co	0.00	257.00	0.00		1,375.28	618.00	4,407.74	6,447.00
M Isola	1,897.97		0.00		0.00		0.00	
N Caetano	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	320.00
N J Bushnell	0.00		0.00		0.00		3,321.50	
Nunez & Co	0.00		0.00		0.00		80.00	
P Nunez	676.50		0.00		0.00		0.00	
P M Triay	0.00		0.00	275.00	0.00		0.00	
Phillips & Co	47,423.56	627.18	85,195.58	5,433.30	128,161.51	326.40	131,193.75	2,289.00
R Pilley	8,117.57	2,224.20	4,306.00	2,331.20	53,417.82		100,002.26	5,781.00
SR Bossino	2,474.15	426.00	0.00	2,432.00	11,761.66	1,917.00	10,020.46	14,458.45
S J Bullock	11,948.11	767.50	1,222.55	544.00	0.00	3,070.80	0.00	
S French Davies	0.00		2,633.33	382.50	0.00	269.50	0.00	
Stagnetto & Co	4,838.47		5,063.71	910.00	2,880.74	540.00	0.00	
Triay & Triay	8,961.98	186.00	4,184.39		10,654.39		17,791.86	865.00
Triay Stagnetto Neist	0.00	604.63	0.00	3,457.70	5,942.82	4,730.00	8,356.11	9,918.20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>306,657.22</b>	<b>7,582.61</b>	<b>251,917.61</b>	<b>24,304.65</b>	<b>373,853.21</b>	<b>27,129.20</b>	<b>365,147.92</b>	<b>82,592.85</b>

Cont...

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368/2005**

**Answer to Question 1366**

The following is a breakdown of Private Sector Fees for Legal Drafting expenditure for 2004/2005.

<u>FIRM</u>	<u>DATE OF PAYMENT</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Michael Llamas	28-Jun-04	Implementation of Savings Directive	£8,160.00
Dennis Figueras	28-Sep-04	The Animal By-Productions Regulations 2004	£1,160.00
Dennis Figueras	30-Nov-04	The Animal By-Productions Regulations 2004; Financial Services Regulations; Fiduciary Services Rules; Banking Bill	£2,700.00
Dennis Figueras	28-Jan-05	Medical & Health Ordinance (Amendment) Bill 2005	£3,820.00
Michael Llamas	28-Jan-05	Implementation of EC Regulation 1/2003; Implementation of the Electronics Communications Package	£30,790.00
Dennis Figueras	25-Feb-05	Transposition of Council Directive 2001/19/EC; Draft Medical & Health Ordinance (Amendment) Bill 2005	£840.00
Hassans	01-Mar-05	Luxembourg SICAR Legislation	£1,950.00
Dennis Figueras	30-Mar-05	Transposition of Council Directive 2001/19/EC; Veterinary Surgeons Bill 2005; Architects Bill 2005	£980.00
			<b><u>£50,400.00</u></b>

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368/2005**

**Answer to Question 1367**

The following is a breakdown of expenditure in respect of Private Sector Fees for Legal Advice for 2004/2005.

<u>LAW FIRM</u>	<u>DATE OF PAYMENT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	29-Apr-04	£19,856.00
Conor Quigley QC	29-Apr-04	£4,935.00
Hassans	10-May-04	£2,880.00
Triay & Triay	17-May-04	£15,968.10
KPMG	17-May-04	£1,500.00
White & Case	18-May-04	£1,921.13
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	20-May-04	£1,651.50
White & Case	01-Jun-04	£6,792.33
J Dingemans QC	25-Jun-04	£3,000.00
White & Case	30-Jun-04	£2,952.05
Charles Russell	01-Jul-04	£11,435.75
Michael Beloff QC	12-Jul-04	£17,275.00
Adam Lewis	12-Jul-04	£3,100.00
Clearly Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton	14-Jul-04	£33,577.87

cont.....

**CONTD ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368/2005**

**Cont Answer to Question 1367**

White & Case	30-Jul-04	£664.48
Ipat Ltd.	12-Aug-04	£8,442.40
White & Case	24-Aug-04	£1,158.43
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	28-Aug-04	£3,250.00
Triay & Triay	01-Sep-04	£4,375.00
Triay & Triay	01-Sep-04	£19,200.00
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	01-Sep-04	£2,475.00
White & Case	17-Sep-04	£1,309.39
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	23-Sep-04	£27,200.00
Cruz & Co.	29-Sep-04	£13,369.00
White & Case	04-Nov-04	£11,319.27
White & Case	24-Dec-04	£1,116.77
Hon Michael Beloff QC & Adam Lewis	23-Dec-04	£7,025.00
Penningtons Solicitors	23-Dec-04	£9,586.00
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	23-Dec-04	£3,500.00

cont.....



**CONTD ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368/2005**

**Cont Answer to Question 1367**

De Pfyffer & Associates	31-Dec-04	£48,901.67
Professor Jeffrey Jowell QC	14-Jan-05	£74,107.00
Michael Llamas	14-Jan-05	£24,480.00
Michael Llamas	19-Jan-05	£64,464.00
Triay & Triay	19-Jan-05	£8,400.00
White & Case	21-Jan-05	£1,129.29
Clearly Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton	27-Jan-05	£185,485.83
Hassans	27-Jan-05	£6,783.90
Clearly Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton	31-Jan-05	£44,287.96
Triay, Stagnetto, Neish	10-Feb-05	£840.00
Michael Llamas	11-Feb-05	£60,010.00
Professor Alain Pellet	17-Feb-05	£8,360.54
Clearly Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton	17-Feb-05	£93,569.33
White & Case	18-Feb-05	£698.56
Charles Russell	17-Mar-05	£3,740.80
		<b><u>£866,094.35</u></b>

Cont....

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368/2005****ANSWER TO QUESTION 1368**

The breakdown of amounts paid to each law firm paid in respect of civil legal assistance and criminal legal aid for the current financial year is as follows:

	Legal Assistance	Legal Aid
A MacDonald	6,933.90	0.00
Attias & Levy	1,533.60	12,235.00
C A Gomez & Co	97,004.44	2,670.00
Central Clinic	0.00	210.00
G Wilson	300.00	0.00
Gold Law	7,687.48	820.00
Hassans	56,530.20	10,321.20
Howard Cohen	200.00	0.00
Ian Watts	0.00	4,037.00
Isola & Isola	31,844.28	6,517.63
J Leighton Williams QC	43,000.00	0.00
J Lucas	650.00	0.00
Janis Evans	32,520.75	0.00
M Bishop	4,441.60	0.00
Marrache & Co	3,697.74	4,239.10
M Callaghan	1,600.00	0.00
Phillips & Co	236,002.09	777.00
Quest Services	250.00	0.00
Radcliffes LeBrasseur	2,766.65	0.00
Ray Pilley	19,583.50	400.00
S J Bullock & Co	31,180.34	1,540.00
S R Bossino	19,535.60	11,880.00
Simon Levene	500.00	0.00
Triay & Triay	29,884.20	1,151.30
Triay Stagnetto Neish	1,455.37	795.00
Verrals	0.00	1,482.00
A Haynes	0.00	150.00
	£629,101.74	£59,225.23

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1365 TO 1368 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister agree with me that it appears that we are well on the way again to exceeding the Estimate in respect of legal assistance and legal aid if the first six months of the year are replicated in the next six months of the year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes indeed, and it does emphasise the Government's determination to deal with not so much the legal aid, because I think that legal aid expenditure is actually remarkably low, but the legal assistance, including as it does such a disproportionate element of uncontested matrimonial proceedings in respect of which there is a long and often unnecessarily extended public expense haggle over access and alimony, or sharing of assets and that there are cheaper ways of doing that than stretching out legal aid claims or actions.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact, one of the issues that he will have heard me mention in my budget speeches before is the fact that one of the points I take with the hon Lady in respect of social services that it plays into the hands of those who would rather see matters not settled if a report into a respective child welfare takes longer than is necessary. Let me assure him that he is right to assume that my concern is not so much in relation to legal aid where we are dealing with criminal matters and the liberty of the individual, but certainly in relation to what appears to be the abusive element of legal assistance being paid.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course, it is not that the Government are unsympathetic to the plight of usually the financially weaker partner which is the woman in the breakdown of a relationship, it is not as if the Government resent having to fund but we resent having to fund it in a way which is unnecessarily lengthy and expensive when there are other ways in which the same degree of justice can be achieved at much cheaper cost. The Chief Justice is working and is at an advanced stage of drafting new Matrimonial Causes Rules which will impact on the context of reconciliation, or arbitration, or mediation procedures on these questions of access and financial settlement. The Government will then judge what he does, if what he does does the trick then so be it, if not we may have to go further as the UK have done and impose some of these things in a more statutory way. I think it is right that people who are the victims of matrimonial breakdown should have affordable access to judicial resolution of their differences, usually not the breakdown of the marriage itself which is usually uncontentious, what is at stake is not that but the process and the procedure and the length of time that it takes, and the apparent interest that some people may have in dragging it out rather than settling it as quickly as possible. That is the aspect.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I associate myself with those remarks, in particular those that relate to the need for those who require assistance when going through these difficult times to have that usually legal assistance with them, and despite our common profession it would certainly appear that the culprits in relation to these potential abuses are not the people who need the help.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No indeed, and as this is a rare occasion on which we appear to agree entirely on an issue, perhaps he should milk it for a while longer. I think very often there are two victims of these practices, one is the taxpayer that foots the bill but very often the people who are in the matrimonial breakdown situation are not done any favours by having the period of hostility between them dragged out, and it certainly does their children no good whatsoever.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am surprised only simply to add these words, that sometimes these matters are not just dragged out but actually exacerbated entirely by those who then become the beneficiaries of these payments.

**NO. 1369 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ARREARS PAYMENT AGREEMENT**

Can Government state how many Arrears Payment Agreements were in existence as at 31 March 2005 in respect of social insurance and employment injuries contributions or the aggregate value of such outstanding arrears?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of 114 agreements for the repayment of £4,251,045.29 in respect of Social Insurance were in place as at 31 March 2005; the amount outstanding at this date stood at £3,590,127.01.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1369 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister tell us by when the £3.5 million outstanding will be repaid, in other words, what is the long stop date of the longest agreement that he has referred us to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot I am afraid.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does he have the level at which these payments are coming in, because then it would be possible to get an estimate of how long it will take?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well he can almost work out the rate from the answer that he has had. If agreements were in place as at 31<sup>st</sup> March for £4,251,045 and by now it is down.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Was it 30<sup>th</sup> November that the £3.5 million figure was correct, so that we can do that exercise?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know the date. The value at this date, I think the £3.59 million is 31<sup>st</sup> March not now, because of course these things were in place but did not start at 31<sup>st</sup> March so by 31<sup>st</sup> March they had already been paid off in part. So he cannot deduce anything from the figures.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Chief Minister have in the information that he is usually provided with in respect of supplementaries, the breakdown of these 114 between individuals and corporate debtors?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, but I would expect the vast majority to be corporate.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister confirm that these agreements are all done by the Central Arrears Unit or are some of them done by the individual departments themselves?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, they are all done by the Arrears Unit.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1370 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the cost of all travel by the Chief Minister on Government business since the last answer in this House to date stating:

- (a) what the purpose of travel was;
- (b) who travelled with the Chief Minister;
- (c) who the Chief Minister met on each of the journeys undertaken; and
- (d) a breakdown of the travel expenses incurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1371 and 1372 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1371 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

Given that at the time of the last Question and Answer session the information was not available, what was the cost of the attendance by the Chief Minister at the Labour Party Conference 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1370 and 1372 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1372 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

Given that at the time of the last Question and Answer session the information was not available, what was the cost of the attendance by the Chief Minister at the Conservative Party Conference 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

With the usual caveat that I cannot give him details of everybody that I have met, perhaps he would like to modify his questions to refer to the purpose of the visit. I hand the hon Member a schedule with the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1372/2005**  
**Answer to Q1370**

**Chief Minister's travel on official business from October 2005 to date**

Date	Purpose	Persons travelling	Met with	Chief Minister's Travel Costs	
				Air fares & travel £	Accommodation £
10-Oct-2005	3rd meeting of Trilateral Forum	Chief Minister/ Chief Secretary/ Assistant Chief Secretary/ Media Director/ Bodyguards x 2	UK and Spanish delegations	526	0
	Gibraltar Day in London/ Overseas Territories Chief Ministers' Conference/ Oxford University Law Society		Various at Gibraltar Day events/ Foreign & Commonwealth Office staff/ Oxford University Law Society members		
16-Oct-2005		CM/ CS/ MD/ Private Secretary (Legal)/ Private Secretary (Projects)		978	389
21-Nov-2005	Commonwealth Business Forum 2005 - Malta	CM/ Principal Private Secretary	Forum delegates/ Prime Minister of Malta	1,004	479

**Answer to Q1371/2005**

Cost of attendance by the Chief Minister at the Labour Party Conference 2005: **£1,392**

**Answer to Q1372/2005**

Cost of attendance by the Chief Minister at the Conservative Party Conference 2005: **£1,206**

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1370 TO 1372 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask the Chief Minister to confirm that this is the cost of his travel and not the cost of the whole delegation travelling? It would be quite uncharacteristic for him to have travelled with others for £526 in October, this is just his travel is it not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister tell us why it is that there is no accommodation cost in respect of 10<sup>th</sup> October 2005? Was that a day trip so to speak?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because so friendly are these trilateral forum meetings now that the host pays for the hotel accommodation of the visiting delegation. So just as we were the host and funded the Faro hotels, so too the Spanish Government paid for the costs of the Mallorca accommodation.

**NO. 1373 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

How many tradesmen have left Buildings and Works in the past five years and of those how many have been replaced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of 26 tradesmen have left Buildings and Works in the past five years. None of the posts have yet been replaced.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1373 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Do the Government intend to replace 26 within a short period of time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Some of them.

**NO. 1374 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**AUDIT OFFICE**

Can Government state for how long the Contract Officer in the Audit Office had been employed when his contract was terminated on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005 and what grade he held and what salary he was employed at and for how long the term of the original contract was?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No contract officers employed by the Gibraltar Audit Office have had their contracts terminated.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1374 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe it was in the previous House that he told me that the explanation for a supplementary payment, that was in one of the supplementary funding things, was an ex-gratia gratuity paid to a contract officer when his contract was terminated. That is why the question is here.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but the question relates to an officer whose contract was terminating, that suggests that it was terminated by the employer, it was not. He resigned and although he was not entitled to a gratuity the Government nevertheless decided to give him one, gratuity in lieu of pension, these payments that contract officers get. I am not willing to mention the name, but there is an officer who had been on contract as an auditor with effect from 19<sup>th</sup> February 2001 for three years, in September 2001 he was appointed Audit Manager on a three year contract as from 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2001, at the end of the three years in September 2004 his contract was extended until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004, on 9<sup>th</sup> December he notified the Principal Auditor of his decision to leave the Audit Office at the end of his contract extension date which was December 2004. Therefore, the officer left at the end of his extension and did not seek a further extension. So he had been employed on contract in the Audit Office for just over three years and ten months. He was then on the maximum point of the Audit Manager pay scale at 2004 rates, which is £41,170 per annum, and on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 an ex-gratia payment amounting to £13,898.38 was made to him in

recognition of his years of service and the fact that he had not been the beneficiary of any pension.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just point out that the only reason why I put 'terminated' here is because that was the word used in the answer the last time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The contract terminated and it was terminated, I cannot remember the exact phrase used last time. It was not, it just expired.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So 'terminated' was the wrong answer then. The answer should have been 'when the contract expired'. The original contract for three years, did that have the clause that frequently exists for non-pensionable officers of a 25 per cent gratuity?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe unjustifiable practice appears to exist, we are in the process of putting an end to, whereby if one is an ex-patriate contract officer it is thought necessary to compensate one for lack and absence of a pension, but somehow if one is contracted locally it is thought not to be appropriate. I think there is absolutely no justification for that so the Government will either offer this or alternatively, offer to include them in the Provident No. 2 or the Provident No. 3 Scheme.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, so the answer is that there was no contractual right to a gratuity because he was locally recruited.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

**NO. 1375 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government provide an update on the status of the sale of Gibtelecom shares?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I met last month with Verizon's Group President for International affairs in Gibraltar. He confirmed that Verizon are now looking to quickly complete their exit from Europe and other international retail markets, and are therefore looking to proceed with the sale of their equity in Gibtelecom. To this end prospective purchasers of Verizon's shareholding will make a presentation to the Government in January.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1375 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will Slovenia Telecom be one of these prospective buyers making a presentation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, through their mobile subsidiary Mobitel.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the actual sale require the agreement of the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it does not. The terms of the joint venture agreement between Verizon and the Government does not require, technically, the Government's consent but of course for practical purposes it might as well because nobody is going to buy a 50/50 investment to buy a gridlock from day one, especially when the other partner is the government of a territory, so no one would buy unless the Government signalled that they were content but that does not mean it is a contractual requirement, which it is not.

ORAL

NO. 1376 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**SENIOR FIRE OFFICERS**

Can Government state whether they have now looked at and/or come to a policy decision in respect of the claim from retired Senior Fire Officers regarding backdated pay and conditions?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

No policy decision has been taken yet.



ORAL

NO. 1377 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government provide an update on the status of the new contract with Land Property Services?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The main Heads of Terms have been agreed and the contract with Land Property Services Ltd is in the process of being finalised. This is expected shortly.

**NO. 1378 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PENSIONERS ASSOCIATION**

Why has the Chief Minister not agreed to meet the Committee of the Pensioners Association?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Pensioners Association have met with officials in my office and with the Minister responsible for the issues that they are concerned about. They have also set out their detailed views on all the issues in writing to No. 6 and to other Ministers. The Government also meet with the Gibraltar Senior Citizens Association and with the Pensioners Committee of the Union GGCA Prospect. The Government in general, and I, are fully aware of their views and aspirations many of which coincide with the Government's policy commitments set out in our election manifesto. I believe that the vast majority of senior citizens and pensioners in Gibraltar recognise and acknowledge this Government's splendid record of progress for the elderly on many fronts both economic and social.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1378 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question is a very simple one, the Chief Minister meets so many people, he travels far and wide, it costs him a bomb to go as far as he sometimes goes and yet why, he has not yet told us why, he has refused to meet the committee of the Pensioners Association. Has he not got time for them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is responsible for his statements in this House, he assumes that I have refused to meet them, I do not know on what evidence he says that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am responsible for my statements in this House and as the hon Gentleman knows, he has been requested a meeting and instead, as he told us, they have met with his officials. Why has he not met the committee of the Pensioners Association?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the hon Member will surely recognise that there is a difference between refusing to meet with somebody and not having met with someone yet. It is not the same thing.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Why has the Chief Minister not met the committee of the Pensioners Association? Why is he running away from the question? It is easy, it is straightforward, he has got a privileged brain, he knows what I am asking him, why does he not tell us?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I take that as a compliment from the hon Gentleman, I would never say of myself that I have a privileged brain but I will certainly accept the compliment from him. Well, he has had the answer that he is going to get.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is not good enough for the Chief Minister simply to say that they have met with officials in his office, that he meets other committees or that his Government meets other committees and that his manifesto is as splendid as he says it is. Let him not avoid the question any further, let him not hide behind language and let him tell this House why he has not met with the committee of the Pensioners Association. Does he not have time for them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe that the vast majority of senior citizens and pensioners in Gibraltar recognise and acknowledge the huge amount of time that I and the Government have for them, as is evident from our splendid record of progress for the elderly on many fronts, both economic and social.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am loathe to give him another opportunity to try and douse himself with his own praise as to how well he does for pensioners. If he is doing so well for them, why will he not meet the gentlemen who make up this committee of pensioners and why will he not tell us why he will not meet them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not told him that I will not meet with them, I have told him that we know exactly what it is that they want, that they have met with my officials and explained what they want, their views, they have met with Ministers, the Government are fully aware of what their views are to the extent that some of the things that they want are copied straight out of our manifesto, there is no need for me to meet with them. For the rest of it he has had the answer that he has had and it is the only one that he is getting, and if he gets up again he will get it again.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister agree to meet the committee of the Pensioners Association?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister does not make appointments for the good offices of the Member of the Opposition.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have not purported to fix the appointment for that, all I have asked is will the Chief Minister meet with them, yes or no? He has refused to tell me why he has not met with them. I am not asking him to give me a date and a time so that I can put it to them. His people can talk to their people, as they say, but will he agree to meet them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member has had the answer and he is not getting a different one.

ORAL

**NO. 1379 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Will Government state whether as previously stated as part of the Eastside development a new power generating facility will be built?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There has been no change in this regard and the position therefore remains as previously stated.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1380 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**

What, if any, further progress has been made in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1381 of 2005.

**NO. 1381 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**

Will Government now agree to provide the Opposition with copies of the formal pleadings either openly or in confidence in respect of the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission, given that the hearings are expected to commence during the course of the coming year and the pleadings will then become publicly accessible?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The written stage of the proceedings is closed. The Government are now waiting for the Court to set a date for the oral hearing.

The premise of the hon Member's question is, I am advised, not correct since the pleadings do not become publicly accessible documents when the hearings commence.

However, having sought advice from the Government's Lawyers in Brussels, and reflecting that advice, the Government do not consider it appropriate to hand copies of the pleadings in this case to the hon Members, either openly or in confidence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1380 AND 1381 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

At the end of the day when the matter is dealt with in the Court, there will be reference to the pleadings which will be referred to orally and openly in those proceedings which are public. I cannot imagine why it is that it would not be possible for the Opposition to have sight of the pleadings at least in confidence. Perhaps the Chief Minister might care to give us a bit more of the detail behind that cryptic advice which has persuaded him not to provide us with any access to them.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No the advice is not cryptic, it is perfectly clear and unambiguous and it is to the effect that the Government should not do that because it is most unusual, it will refer necessarily our pleadings to the pleadings of the other side, which we are certainly bound not to disclose, and that they would require a huge amount of editing of the

document, even if we were willing to give our pleadings they told us not to do it. Therefore we will take advice. I have to say that those who have advised us, who by the way is not a Gibraltar lawyer in Brussels, have expressed surprise that the request should even have been put.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I really do not give two hoots whether or not surprise has been expressed at my requests. Let me tell the Chief Minister that given that it appears that the advice is that it would put us in default of obligations to others, I am not going to press him in respect of certainly the defence which may have been filed or are required which would necessarily make cross-reference to the defence. Can I ask him whether that particular reason for not disclosing the pleadings extends to our claim, which will not cross-refer to any other document as it is an originating document?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member may give two hoots for the advice of our very expensive lawyers in Brussels but we do not give two hoots, we give many more than two. Therefore we do not intend to ignore the advice, so my answer stands. The Government, reflecting the advice that they have received, do not consider it appropriate to hand copies of the pleadings in this case to any of them to the hon Member.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

But the advice that he has told us that he has received relates to the cross-referencing with other documents. Those pleadings can only be the defence filed by the Commission and others or the statements by others who are interested parties in this case. The originating document, the statement of claim or its European equivalent, will not contain any cross-reference and is not the subject of that part of the advice which the Chief Minister has revealed he obtained. So will he at least agree to release that originating document?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The advice refers to all the pleadings, including the Government's originating claim.



ORAL

**NO. 1382 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GOVERNMENT ATTENDANCES AT CONFERENCES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of their attendance at all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the months of October to the end of November 2005, giving the name of the conference, the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet.

**Answer to Question 1382**

A Finance Centre Lunch was hosted by the Chief Minister at the Royal Automobile Club, London on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2005 as part of the events of Gibraltar Day in London 2005.

Attended by: Mr James Tipping – Finance Centre Director  
Mr Joseph Macano – Director Licensing Unit  
Mrs Sabrina Ramagge – Executive Officer  
Miss Mireille Alsina – Administrative Officer

Flights and Accommodation	£1,802.00
Expenses	£ 901.63
Lunch at the RAC	£8,259.06
TOTAL:	<hr/> £10,962.69

A total of 106 persons attended the Finance Centre Lunch.

OECD Global Forum Conference in Melbourne, Australia held on 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

Attended by: Mr James Tipping – Finance Centre Director

Flights and Accommodation	£5,496.67
Expenses	£ 310.89
TOTAL:	<hr/> £5,807.56

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1382 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I safely assume that the answer provided in respect of the first part of the schedule provided does not include the Chief Minister's travel, only the travel and accommodation of those four individuals mentioned in the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

On this occasion he has got to be a bit circumspect because many of the players were there anyway. For example, I was in London anyway for Gibraltar Day so there is no cost of travel for me or accommodation for the Finance Centre, but the ones who are there only for the Finance Centre thing have been included there.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does he have a breakdown, in respect of the OECD Conference in Melbourne, where flights and accommodation have cost £5,496 between flights and accommodation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I do not, I am afraid.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Going back to the first one, do the expenses of £901 relate to that lunch or were those expenses related to other aspects of that trip? I see that there is a figure of £8,259 which I assume is the cost of the lunch, are the expenses related to that directly or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would expect that the £901 are the other travelling expenses of the four individuals therein mentioned, subsistence, taxis, whatever the means of travel they use. I would not expect the £901 to relate to the costs of the lunch itself.

ORAL

**NO. 1383 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BETTING INDUSTRY**

Can Government provide the latest available figures for the number of persons employed in the betting industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by company and by nationality, showing how many are Gibraltarian and the date when the figures apply?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised that there has been no further compilation of these figures since the information provided in answer to Question No. 977 of 2005 at the last meeting of this House. This stated that as at 30 September 2005 a total of 1,349 persons were employed by 15 gaming companies. That is the latest we have.

ORAL

**NO. 1384 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

Can Government list the persons from Gibraltar who were present at the Finance Centre lunch which took place as part of Gibraltar Day in London?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1385 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1385 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

How many persons were invited to the Royal Automobile Club for the Finance Centre lunch at the start of Gibraltar Day in London, how many attended and how many were from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of 115 persons were invited of which 105 persons attended, 47 were from Gibraltar.

Also in attendance at the lunch in a working capacity were nine journalists/media personnel of which eight were from Gibraltar. These are not included in the figure given.

I hand the hon Member a list of the persons from Gibraltar who attended.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1385/2005**

<b>LIST OF PERSONS ATTENDING</b>	
James	Tipping
Joe	Macano
Mireille	Alsina
Sabrina	Ramagge
John	Reyes
Francis	Cantos
Marcus	Killick
Albert D	Langston
Marina	Dominguez Steglich
Edgar	Lavarello
Sebastian	Moerman
Ian	Le Breton
Roy	Clinton
Emilio	Gomez
Jose Julio	Pisharello
Philip	Canessa
Darren A	McComb
Wifred C	Perez
Javier	De Mendieta
Peter	Isola
Bruno	Callaghan
Charles	Gomez
Elliot	Federico
Hans	Diederer
Tony	Millan
Angu	Shivdasani
Bernard	Hazell
Cindy	Glasby
Penny	Hudson
Thomas P	Rickli
Urs	Heuni
Isaac	Marrache
Abraham	Marrache
Steve	Quinn
Chris	Wawn
Malcolm	Ruffell
Ed	Ware
David	Dumas
Joseph	Caruana
Marvin	Cartwright
Richard	De la Rosa
Tim	Streatfeild-James
Andrew	Cardona
Tom	Phillips
Trevor	Nichols
Robert	Vasquez
Charles	Simpson
Christine	Podesta
Darren	Durante
Alice	Mascarenhas
John	Bugeja
Stephen	Ignacio
Charles	Bossano
Susana	Perez Custodio
Paul	Cosquieri

**NO. 1386 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE – VICTUALLING YARD**

What plans do Government have for the Victualling Yard once this is surrendered to Government by the Gibraltar Heritage Trust?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Assuming that the hon Member does not consider the tank to be part of the Victualling Yard, the Government's intention is to relocate public services and facilities into these buildings and site, provided that they are compatible with the building's historical and heritage value and importance.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1386 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has any payment been made by the Government to the Trust in compensation for the years in the lease that remain?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well as he knows, the Trust has been in possession of these buildings for some time and in fact has been using them as a warehouse, on commercial rental terms, which has been their source of income. Leaving to one side the question of whether that is compatible with the terms of the lease that they received, the fact of the matter is that the Government acknowledge that they have now become accustomed to the lifestyle that that level of income gives them and therefore we have agreed to maintain that level of income when they hand the lease back to the Government. I think it is true to say that in all the years that that site has been out of the Government's hands it has never been used for anything more heritage-relevant than a warehouse or private stores.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What is the level of income that we are talking about?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is £30,000 a year.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1387 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FREIGHT FORWARDING SERVICES**

Can Government say when the tender for the provision of freight forwarding services to the Government closed and explain the reason for the time it is taking to award this tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The closing date for receipt of tenders was 22 April 2005. The position remains as given in answer to Question No. 952 of 2005 and that is that it remains under consideration. As to explaining the reasons as to the time that it has taken to award, the Government are reconsidering whether it is actually sensible to proceed with a tender of this sort.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1388 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DATA PROTECTION ORDINANCE**

When do Government expect to bring the Data Protection Ordinance into effect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government will be organising a number of public seminars and publishing user-friendly guidelines explaining the legislation and the rights and obligations that it imposes in the new year. The Irish Data Protection Commissioner has been invited to Gibraltar to lead the seminar and he has accepted. The reason why it is the Irish Commissioner is because we have modelled our legislation on the Irish legislation rather than the much more complex UK legislation transposing this directive. Once all these events have happened, the Government will commence the Ordinance shortly thereafter. The target date for that is certainly during the first half of next year.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1389 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Gibraltar Day events in London which took place in October this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1390 to 1392 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1390 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

Can Government list the persons from Gibraltar who were invited to and attended the Gibraltar Day events in London?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1389, 1391 and 1392 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1391 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

Can Government list the UK Parliamentarians who were invited to and attended the Gibraltar Day events in London in October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1389, 1390 and 1392 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 1392 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

How many Gibraltar Government or GDC employees attended the Gibraltar Day events in London in October of this year and what posts do they hold?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I hand the hon Member a schedule with the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1392****Answer to Question 1389**

The cost of the Gibraltar Day was as follows:

Hire of Guildhall and Events Management	£13,763.25
Catering	£33,108.33
Printing, photography and postage	£10,647.17
Miscellaneous	£11,601.97
	<u>£69,120.72</u>

**Answer to Question 1390**

The following is a list of the persons from Gibraltar who were invited and attended:

H.E. The	Governor
Monsignor Charles	Caruana
James	Tipping
Joe	Macano
Mireille	Alsina
Sabrina	Ramagge
Peter	Caruana
John	Reyes
Francis	Cantos
Marcus	Killick
Albert D	Langston
Marina	Dominguez Steglich
Edgar	Lavarello
Sebastian	Moerman
Ian	Le Breton
Roy	Clinton
Emilio	Gomez
Jose Julio	Pisharello
Philip	Canessa
Darren A	McComb
Wilfred C	Perez
Javier	De Mendieta
Peter	Isola
Bruno	Callaghan
Charles	Gomez
Elliot	Federico
Hans	Diedereren
Tony	Millan

Contd...



**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1392****Cont Answer to Question 1390**

Angu	Shivdasani	
Bernard	Hazell	
Cindy	Glasby	
Penny	Hudson	
Thomas P	Rickli	
Urs	Heuni	
Isaac	Marrache	
Abraham	Marrache	
Steve	Quinn	
Chris	Wawn	
Malcolm	Ruffell	
Ed	Ware	
David	Dumas	
Joseph	Caruana	
Marvin	Cartwright	
Richard	De la Rosa	
Tim	Streatfeild-James	
Andrew	Cardona	
Tom	Phillips	
Trevor	Nichols	
Robert	Vasquez	
Charles	Simpson	
Commodore	Adair	
Col. John	Porral	
Col. Eddie	Guerrero	
Lt. Col. Mark	Randall	
W.O.	Bensadon	
Capt. Ivor	Lopez	
Major Colin	Risso	
Major Danny	Freyone	
Major Mark	Hurado	
2nd Lt.	Pozzo	
Sgt. Major	Davies	
Michael	Tampin	
Luis	Montali	X
John	Cabezutto	
Darren	Durante	
Alice	Mascarenhas	
Johnny	Budeja	
Stephen	Ignacio	
Charles	Bossano	
Susana	Custodio	
Paul	Cosquieri	
Stephen	Cumming	
Christine	Podesta	

Contd..

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1392****Answer to Question 1391**

The following is a list of UK Parliamentarians who were invited and attended.

<b>Title</b>	<b>First name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	
Mr	Douglas	Alexander	Unable to attend
Mr	John	Austin	
Mr	Tony	Baldry	
Mr	Graham	Brady	
Mr	David	Cameron	
Sir	Patrick	Cormack	
Ms	Claire	Curtis-Thomas	
Mr	Ian	Davidson	
The Rt Hon	David	Davis	Unable to attend
Mr and Mrs	Jim	Dobbin	
The Rt Hon	Iain	Duncan Smith	
Mr	Mark	Francois	
Mrs	Cheryl	Gillan	
Mr	Mike	Hancock	
Mr	Jimmy	Hood	
The Rt Hon Sir	Gerald	Kaufman	Unable to attend
Mr	Fraser	Kemp	
Mr	Robert	Key	
Dr	Ashok	Kumar	
The Rt Hon	Francis	Maude	Unable to attend
The Hon	William Alexander	Scott	
Miss	Geraldine	Smith	
Mrs	Angela	Watkinson	
Mr	Bill	Wiggin	
Sir	Nicholas	Winterton	
Lady	Ann	Winterton	
Mr and Mrs	Danny	Alexander	
The Rt Hon	Michael	Ancram	
Mr	Joe	Benton	Unable to attend
Mr	Colin	Breed	
Mr and Mrs	David	Clelland	
Mr	David	Crausby	
Mr	James	Dudridge	
Mrs	Louise	Ellman	
Mr	Tobias	Ellwood	
Mr	Nigel	Evans	
Dr	Liam	Fox	Unable to attend
Mr	Edward	Garnier	
Mr	David	Hamilton	
Mr	Fabian	Hamilton	
The Rt Hon	Geoff	Hoon	Unable to attend
The Rt Hon	Michael	Howard	
The Hon	Lindsay	Hoyle	
The Rt Hon	Adam	Ingram	
Mr	Paul	Keetch	
Ms	Julie	Kirkbride	
Mrs	Eleanor	Laing	
Mr	Bob	Laxton	
Mr	Tim	Loughton	
Mr	Eddie	O'Hara	Cont...

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1392****Cont Answer to Question 1391**

Mr	Mike	Penning	
Mr	Andrew	Rosindell	
Mr	Mark	Simmonds	
Dr	Bob	Spink	
The Rt Hon	Jack	Straw	Unable to attend
Mr	John	Bercow	
The Rt Hon	Bruce	George	
Mr	Simon	Hughes	
Mr	Brian	Jenkins	
Mr	Andrew	Mackinlay	
Mr	Ken	Purchase	
The Rt Hon Dr	John	Reid	Unable to attend
The Rt Hon Sir	John	Stanley	
The Lord	David	Chidgey	
The Lord and Lady	Iain Alexander Douglas	Dundonald	Unable to attend
The Lord	Norman	Foster of Thames Bank	Unable to attend
The Rt Hon the Lord	Tristan	Garel-Jones	
The Rt Hon the Lord	Richard Edward	Howe of Aberavon	Unable to attend
The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor Alderman	Michael	Savory	
The Rt Hon the Lord and Lady	Donald	Anderson	
The Lord	Tony	Banks of Stratford	
The Lord	Nicholas William	Bethell	Unable to attend
The Lord	Dennis Turner	Bilston	
The Lord	William Henry	Brett	
The Lord	Keith	Brookman	
The Lord	David Garfield	Davies of Coity	
The Lord	Ambrose Charles	Greenway	
The Lord	Doug	Hoyle	
The Lord	Greville	Janner of Braunstone	
The Rt Hon the Lord & Lady	Richard Napier	Luce of Adur	
The Lord	Jack	Merrivale	
The Lord	John	Astor	Unable to attend
The Lord	John	Astor of Hever	Unable to attend
The Rt Hon the Lord	John Taylor	Kilclooney	
Lord		Mereworth	Unable to attend
The Lord and Lady	John	Monson	
The Rt Hon the Lord	Tom	Pendry	

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1392**

There were 11 Gibraltar Government and GDC employees who attended the Gibraltar Day event in London as follows:

Mr James Tipping	Finance Centre Director
Dr David McCutcheon	Chief Executive, Gibraltar Health Authority
Mr Richard Garcia	Chief Executive, Ministry of Trade, Industry, Employment and Communication
Mr Francis Cantos	Press Officer
Mr Joseph Macano	Senior Officer, Finance Centre
Mr John Reyes	Private Secretary to the Chief Minister (Legal)
Mr Ernest Lima	Director of Finance, Gibraltar Health Authority
Mr Peter Canessa	Chief Executive Officer, Gibraltar Tourist Board
Mr Nicholas Guerrero	Sales Manager, Gibraltar Tourist Board
Mrs Sabrina Ramagge	Executive Officer, Finance Centre
Ms Mireille Alsina	Administrative Officer, Finance Centre

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1389 TO 1392 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say, the figure given here in answer to Question No. 1389 is £69,120.72, does that include the cost of the Finance Centre lunch as well or does this reference to catering does not include that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Gibraltar Day event refers to the Guildhall, so all this information is Guildhall stuff I think. I must say I had assumed that it did not include but he has put me in some doubt now with his supplementary. When I read out the answer I had assumed that it would not have included the Finance Centre lunch at the RAC Club.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1393 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAPE TOWN CONVENTION**

Can Government say whether the EU has now been able to agree the Council Decision authorising Member States to proceed with ratification of the Cape Town Convention and its Aircraft Equipment Protocol following the dispute between the United Kingdom and Spain over the way that it would apply to Gibraltar if extended to us?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1394 of 2005.

**NO. 1394 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CAPE TOWN CONVENTION**

Are Government aware whether the United Kingdom intends as a matter of policy to extend the Cape Town Convention and its Aircraft Equipment Protocol to its Overseas Territories and Dependencies including Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The EU has not been able to pass the Council Resolution to which the hon Member refers in his question. I am advised in relation to his second question, Question No. 1394, that the United Kingdom have not yet taken a decision whether to extend the Cape Town Convention and its Protocols to the Overseas Territories and Dependencies. I hope he understands the difference of Gibraltar's situation compared to the others, and that is that if the European Union ratifies it as an EU, that ratification includes Gibraltar because we are part of the EU. Hence the position. Insofar as the normal international treaty territorial extension, I am advised that the UK have not yet made a policy decision of whether to apply it generally to its Crown Dependencies or Overseas Territories.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1393 AND 1394 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister know what it is specifically about its application in Gibraltar that Spain is objecting to? Do they want the same exclusion clause?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, at the root of this dispute, and others by the way, lies the fact that when we agreed the postboxing system it was limited to certain types of instruments, namely, EU instruments and we specifically ensured that it did not include international agreements when they are collectively ratified by the EU, because there is an increasing tendency by the EU to do that and had we left that particular door open, it would have eventually extended to all international agreements that pass the postboxing because the EU has an ambition that it should ratify these things collectively as a block. Therefore we were careful to ensure that it did not apply precisely to situations of this sort. Namely, where one has an international convention

that is not an EU measure but which the EU subscribes as a block, and therefore Spain wants the postboxing arrangements extended to it and we are saying, with the UK support, that the postbox arrangements specifically exclude this and therefore postboxing does not and cannot apply to it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that apparently they decided to proceed without waiting for the EU to ratify this collectively, if the UK were to follow that route then presumably they would include us or is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer to that supplementary is in the specific answer that I for that very reason gave to the hon Member sitting next to him, and that is that the distinction that I drew between an EU ratification and a Member State ratification, if the EU ratify it as a block that includes Gibraltar because Gibraltar is part of the EU block. If on the other hand individual countries ratify it nationally and unilaterally, then each country decides to which part of its territory it applies, which is the question that the Hon Dr Garcia asked me in relation to the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies, although the UK have not made a policy decision about that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But in the event.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The UK has not decided whether if it extends nationally and unilaterally, as Ireland has done, whether in those circumstances the UK would include the Overseas Territories or not, it has not yet decided.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question is, in the event if it went down that road where we would not automatically be included as we would if it were an EU decision, have the Government had any indication where the UK would then treat us as all the other territories or not? That is the point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure it is a point but the answer is yes, to the extent that it is a point. Either we are dealt with as part of the EU if they sign as a block or we are just another Overseas Territory if it comes to the UK as a nation subscribing to an international convention, which as the hon Member knows the usual way is that the UK normally asks the Overseas Territories whether they want to be. It is not usual for the UK to proceed without asking the Territories whether they wish to be excluded. In other words, it is actually not very usual for the UK to make the unilateral decision not to offer the Territories extension.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1395 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AVIATION MEASURES**

On what date and by whom was the Government made aware of Gibraltar's exclusion from the EU regulation on the blacklisting of unsafe airlines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No formal notification has been made to the Gibraltar Government of Gibraltar's exclusion. This may be because exclusion of Gibraltar from aviation measures is standard systematic, or rather standard systemic misbehaviour on the part of the EU to the point where it is no longer regarded as noteworthy enough to mention.



ORAL

**NO. 1396 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LORD MAYOR'S SHOW IN LONDON**

How and by whom were the Gibraltar students who participated in the Lord Mayor's Show in London chosen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1397 of 2005.

**NO. 1397 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LORD MAYOR'S SHOW IN LONDON**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's participation in the Lord Mayor's Show in London in November?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Students were selected at random by the Director of the London Office. They were mainly chosen from the London Universities and the outskirts of London, as well as students that had friends/accommodation in the London area.

The cost of the Lord Mayor's Show was as follows:-

	£
Participation charge	406.25
Cost of float and design	3,071.87
Event management	1,750.00
Photography	321.36
Miscellaneous	3,399.57
	<u>22,949.05</u>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1396 AND 1397 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Chief Minister referred to accommodation, selecting mainly students from London to allow for the fact that they already had accommodation in London, can the Chief Minister say whether in fact students were also selected who were not from London and whether these had to be accommodated somewhere?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot say that because this is something done at the London end by the Director but I do not recall. My understanding is that the Government did not fund any accommodation for participating students. My understanding is that they stayed with friends.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would the 'miscellaneous' then account for travelling expenses and do we know what else?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know certainly the cost of their travel to London was paid.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1398 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – LAND FRONTIER**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from October 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1399 of 2005.

**NO. 1399 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – BUILDING MATERIALS**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since October 2005 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In respect of import duty generally at the land frontier:

Oct 05	£15,698.85
Nov 05	£18,412.71

In relation to building materials:

Oct 05	£82,580.35
Nov 05	£55,867.20

**ORAL**

**NO. 1400 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8 – A, SUB-HEAD 21**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £50,000 Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005 Research, Development Studies and Professional Fees shown in Head 8-A, Sub-Head 21, showing who the money was paid to, on what date and for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1401 and 1402 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1401 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8 – A, SUB-HEAD 22**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £130,000 Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005 National Day shown in Head 8-A, Sub-Head 22, showing who the money was paid to, on what date and for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1400 and 1402 of 2005.

**NO. 1402 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8 – A, SUB-HEAD 16**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £540,000 Forecast Outturn for 2004/2005 that Head 8-A, Sub-Head 16 Government Lobbying, Hospitality and Travel is sub-divided into giving the number of sub-divisions, and showing the amount spent in each sub-division and its name?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1400**

The information requested by the hon Member in relation to sub-head 21 is set out in the schedule that I hand him.

**Answer to Question No. 1401**

As I have already informed the hon Member in answer to a previous question in relation to sub-head 22, the information requested is too detailed and voluminous and he is in effect asking the Government to publish a Nominal Ledger of all items charged to the sub-head. As I have said to him in the past, if he wants subtotals in respect of any particular item of expenditure I will endeavour to obtain the information for him, otherwise it just breaks down into too many different heads.

**Answer to Question No. 1402**

In relation to sub-head 16:-

	£
Official Travel	147,088.03
Invited Guests	6,268.91
Political	281,808.23
Tercentenary	109,209.88
	<u>544,375.05</u>



**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1402/2005**

**Answer to Question 1400**

Mr L Edmonds	April 04 – March 05	Civil Contingency Advisor	£9157.50
Mr D Figueras	22/4/04	Professional Services icw Electoral Reform/ Public Service Code	£2838.00
	22/3/04	Professional Service icw Pension Legislation	£440.00
	12/5/04	Professionsl Services icw Electoral Reform	£1023.00
	5/7/04	Professionsl Services icw Public Service Code	£924.00
Mouchel Parkman	15/8/04	Professional Services icw Montagu Crescent	£1350.00
Sterling Travel	23/8/04	Travel Costs/ Telecommunication Consultancy	£485.20

contd.....

**CONTD ANSWER TO QUESTION 1402/2005**

**Contd Answer to Question 1400**

Joseph Zammitt	22/10/04	Consultancy Fees/ Statistics Database	£3000.00
	7/3/05	Consultancy Fees/ Statistics Database	£3000.00
Nunez & Co	14/12/04	Professional Fees icw Montagu Crescent	£17,283.78
Sterling Travel	24/1/05	Travel Costs icw Telecommunications Consultancy	£234.20
Mr JR Pendle	24/1/05	Professional Fees icw Telecommunication Consultancy	£3723.68
			<hr/>
			£43,459.36

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1400 TO 1402 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In the answer just given and in the schedule of legal fees paid in respect of drafting matters, I see a reference to a 'D Figueras', is that gentleman the previous Principal Private Secretary of the Chief Minister, previous Clerk of the House or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is not usual for the Government to comment on individuals by name but the answer is yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the position then that this former Civil Servant is now retired and is acting as a contractor to the Government for drafting purposes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, he has certain drafting skills in certain areas of subject matter and he represents good financial value, much cheaper than the legal profession we find.

**NO. 1403 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPUTER AUDIT PROGRAMME**

Can Government confirm whether the original fee paid on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005 to Pricewaterhouse Coopers for the computer audit programme is payable every year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This is not an annual payment. I should perhaps add that there is eventually another annual payment but it is not that.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1403 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, because I think the last time the Chief Minister was not sure whether this meant a renewable licence and he said he would let me know the next time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I will just give him a little bit more information, the original payment of \$22,000 which is £11,457.73, was the initial licence fee and this fee included perpetual use of the licence and two years support and product upgrade. Thereafter, 20 per cent of the then current initial licence fee is payable annually. So after the two years are up it is 20 per cent of \$22,000.

ORAL

**NO. 1404 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state how many questionnaires have been issued to employers in respect of this year's October Employment Survey?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1405 and 1406 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1405 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for part-time employment in respect of Table 12 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality for the group of employers consisting of public entities and government-owned and joint venture companies listed in answer to question 804 of 2005 and including the relevant information in respect of Aqua-Gib and Gibtelecom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1404 and 1406 of 2005.

**NO. 1406 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the figure for full time employment in respect of Table 12 of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report showing the breakdown by industry, sex and nationality for the group of employers consisting of public entities and government-owned and joint venture companies listed in answer to Question 804 of 2005 and including the relevant information in respect of Aqua-Gib and Gibtelecom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1404**

A total of 1,426 October 2005 Employment Survey questionnaires were sent on 5 October 2005.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1405 and 1406**

I hand the hon Member two schedules showing the information requested.

Answer to Question 1406

Answer to Question 1405 of 2005: Table 12: Part -Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, Public Entities & Government Owned JVC's, October 2004

<u>INDUSTRY</u>	<u>ALL</u>		<u>GIBRALTARIAN</u>		<u>UK BRITISH</u>		<u>MOROCCAN</u>		<u>SPANISH</u>		<u>OTHER EU</u>		<u>OTHER</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Shipbuilding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Manuf.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elec/Wtr Supply	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	6	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Whsle/Retail Tr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hotels/Restrnrs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trans/Comm.	2	5	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fin. Intermed.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Real Est./Bus.Ac.	240	0	239	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Admin.	1	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health/Social Wk.	3	41	3	34	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0
Other Services	7	4	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	259	65	254	56	4	3	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	0

cont...



Contd Answer to Question 1406

Answer to Question 1406 of 2005: Table 12: Full-Time Employee Jobs by Industry, Sex and Nationality, Public Entities & Government Owned JVC's, October 2004

<u>INDUSTRY</u>	<u>ALL</u>		<u>GIBALTARIAN</u>		<u>UK BRITISH</u>		<u>MOROCCAN</u>		<u>SPANISH</u>		<u>OTHER EU</u>		<u>OTHER</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Shipbuilding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Manuf.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elec/Wtr Supply	87	14	79	14	1	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Construction	236	17	219	16	1	0	7	1	6	0	2	0	1	0
Whsle/Retail Tr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hotels/Restrntr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trans/Comm.	152	22	132	20	5	2	8	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Fin. Intermed.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Real Est./Bus.Ac.	4	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Admin.	85	58	82	58	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health/Social Wk.	42	221	36	156	2	28	0	2	4	34	0	1	0	0
Other Services	66	14	57	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
TOTAL	672	347	609	279	12	30	23	3	18	34	9	1	1	0

**NO. 1407 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state when they expect to be able to provide the estimated GDP figure for 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Under our masterful stewardship, the GDP for 2003/2004 stood at £560.06 million, representing an increase of 10.4 per cent in money terms and of 8.0 per cent in real terms over the previous year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1407 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say when they will be providing or publishing the breakdown of the figure showing the different components?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I have them here under the income method, the expenditure method are still being finalised.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1408 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CIVIL SERVANTS**

Can Government provide the dates on which each of the posts listed in answer to Question 998 of 2005 became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1409 and 1410 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1409 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CIVIL SERVANTS**

Can Government state whether any of the posts listed in answer to Question 998 of 2005 have since been filled and if so identify which and indicate whether the post has been filled from within the service or by external recruitment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1408 and 1410 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1410 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CIVIL SERVANTS**

Can Government state whether any additional posts in Government Departments have become vacant since the answer to Question 998 of 2005 and if so show the grade and department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

## ANSWER TO QUESTION 1410

Answer to Questions 1408 and 1409

DEPARTMENT	GRADE	NO. OF VACANT POSTS	VACANT SINCE	DATE FILLED	RECRUITMENT	REMARKS
EDUCATION	DEPUTY HEADTEACHER - BAYSIDE	1	01-Oct-05	24-Oct-05	INTERNAL	
	TECHNICIAN - DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY	1	01-Sep-05		INTERNAL	RECRUITMENT IN PROCESS
	CLASSROOM AIDE	2	01-Sep-04 08-May-05	30-Nov-05		
	EDUCATION WELFARE OFFICER	1	28-Oct-04			
	CLEANER	6	11-Jun-05 14-Jun-05 (x2) 01-Jul-05 20-Aug-05 01-Sep-05			
CULTURE	SEO (DESIGNATE)	1	08-Aug-05	01-Nov-05	INTERNAL	
HOUSING	HPTO	1	01-Apr-02			
BUILDINGS & WORKS	HUMAN RESOURCES OFFICER	1	07-Apr-05		EXTERNAL	RECRUITMENT IN PROCESS
	LABOURER	2	06-Nov-03 20-Mar-04			
TECHNICAL SERVICES	SPTO	1	01-May-05	28-Nov-05	INTERNAL	
	HPTO	1	30-Jun-04			
	SEWERMAN	1	14-Apr-03			
	DEPOT WRITER	1	12-Jul-02			
	M/T FITTER (ELEC)	1	13-Mar-00	24-Oct-05	EXTERNAL	
	FABRICATION WELDER	1	06-Jan-03	24-Oct-05	EXTERNAL	
TRANSPORT - TRAFFIC	AO	1	09-May-05	14-Nov-05	INTERNAL	
SOCIAL AFFAIRS	MESSENGER	1	20-Mar-05			
	SOCIAL WORKER	1	18-May-04			TO BE FILLED BY TRAINEE ON SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF STUDIES
	ASSISTANT MANAGERESS - ST BERNADETTE'S	1	01-Sep-05		INTERNAL	RECRUITMENT IN PROCESS
	CLASSROOM AIDE - SPECIAL NEEDS -	2	24-Oct-02	28-Nov-05	INTERNAL	
	ST BERNADETTE'S	15-Apr-05	28-Nov-05	INTERNAL		
	CLEANER	2	09-Apr-00 01-May-00			
	SCHOOL ATTENDANT	1	10-Apr-02			
TRADE & INDUSTRY	SEO	1	21-Mar-05			
	SPTO	1	01-Sep-05		EXTERNAL	RECRUITMENT IN PROCESS
	EO	1	01-Sep-05		INTERNAL	POST TO BE FILLED ON 12-12-05
POSTAL SERVICES	S.O.G. (EX-SORTER)	1	30-Aug-05	17-Oct-05	INTERNAL	
POLICE	CHIEF INSPECTOR	1	03-Sep-05	24-Oct-05	INTERNAL	
	POLICE CONSTABLE	2	02-Sep-05 05-Sep-05			
	MARINE MECHANIC	1	19-Nov-04			
SECRETARIAT	HEO	1	01-Aug-00			
	AO	1	05-Sep-05		INTERNAL	POST TO BE FILLED ON 3-1-06
STATISTICS	AO	1	03-Oct-05	12-Oct-05	INTERNAL	

Cont...

**CONTD ANSWER TO QUESTION 1410**

**Contd Answer to Question 1408 and 1409**

CIVIL STATUS & REGISTRATION	AO	1	31-Aug-05		
TREASURY	AO	2	07-Jun-05 13-Sep-05	12-Oct-05	INTERNAL
	MESSENGER	1	01-Sep-05		
CUSTOMS	CLEANER	1	01-Oct-05		EXTERNAL TENDER Cont...
INCOME TAX	AO	1	27-Jul-05	07-Nov-05	INTERNAL
MAGISTRATES	CLEANER	1	25-Aug-05		EXTERNAL TENDER AWARD
AUDIT	AUDITOR	2	01-Jul-05 01-Jul-05	14-Nov-05	EXTERNAL
	AO	1	27-Jul-05		
GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY	HOSPITAL ATTENDANT	1	01-Oct-05		INTERNAL RECRUITMENT IN PROCESS

**Answer to Question 1410**

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>GRADE</u>	<u>NO. OF VACANT POSTS</u>
EDUCATION	CLASSROOM AIDE - SPECIAL NEEDS (P/T)	2
CULTURE	HEO	1
ENVIRONMENT	P&GS'E'	1
	GRAVEDIGGER	1
BUILDINGS & WORKS	CRAFTSMAN	1
	MT DRIVER	2
TECHNICAL SERVICES	HPTO	1
	TG 1	1
TRANSPORT - TRAFFIC	SENIOR DRIVING AND VEHICLE EXAMINER	1
SOCIAL AFFAIRS	AO	1
	CLASSROOM AIDE - SPECIAL NEEDS (P/T)	2
STATISTICS	AA	1
INCOME TAX	AA	1
PROCUREMENT	EO	1
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS	I.T. OFFICER LEVEL 1	1
PRISON	PRISON OFFICER	1
POLICE	POLICE CONSTABLE	1

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1408 TO 1410 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the case of those posts that have been vacant for a very long time, for example I notice there are one or two that go back to the year 2000 and some go back to 2003 and 2004. I can understand the one in 2005 being in the process of being filled but if there are jobs that have not been done since the year 2000, is it still intended to fill them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

One of the exercises that I have asked to be done is for the current establishment level to be fixed so that we know how many of these are sort of historical that are no longer needed and will not be replaced and how many fall into the different category that will be replaced. Obviously the Public Service changes size and shape and new jobs are created in one part and lost in another, so certainly not all of these will be filled but I think it is important that we know, particular at budget time when we are debating the budget, which can be and in a sense this year's budget document is an accurate guide because there I made sure that departments only sought funding, or rather were only given funding for posts..... Let me put it another way, that departments did not put in funding for posts that may have historically existed but for which there was no serious intention of recruiting. That is probably now quite close to the establishment levels in this year's budget. The rule is that those posts can be refilled if they become vacant. So in a sense what we are doing is eliminating the historical, it is not as if they are driven down every year.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1411 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CIVIL SERVICE – SENIOR OFFICERS**

Can Government explain why the grade of Senior officer prior to 1 August 2003 were on a salary scale with pay points of £53,128, £54,558 and £55,980 and those entering the grade in or after this date have a maximum on their salary scale of £50,647?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1412 of 2005.

**NO. 1412 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CIVIL SERVICE – SENIOR OFFICERS**

Can Government state how many of the Senior Officers currently in post were employed in this grade prior to 1 August 2003 and how many entered after this date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1411**

On implementing the Pay Review for 1 August 2003, all pay scales including the Senior Officer pay scale, whose scale maximum already surpassed the corresponding UK Pay Band analogue maxima were maintained on a personal-to-holder basis. New entrants post 1 August 2003 are placed on a new scale the maxima of which corresponds to the maximum of the UK scale to which Senior Officers are analogued for parity purposes. In other words, the Gibraltar scale had passed the UK maxima and these people are now on a personal-to-holder basis and new recruits into that scale and to that grade only rise to the parity relevant scale maxima.

**Answer to Question No. 1412**

A total of 21 Senior Officers are currently in post, 19 were appointed prior to 1 August 2003 and two after this date.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1411 AND 1412 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the Estimates I believe there are two Senior Officer posts that have got a footnote saying they are personal-to-holder. In fact from the answer the Chief Minister has given me it should be the other way round, there should be 19 that say personal-to-holder and two that do not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, then the note must refer to something else.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think there was one case in the Treasury and one case under Head 8, there is an (a) note next to the Senior Officers and No. 6 Convent Place there are two Senior Officers and there is a footnote that says 'one post held on a personal-to-holder basis'.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh, personal-to-holder basis, it is not an established post. For example, it is not a post that established a Senior Officer. For example, my Principal Private Secretary is currently a Senior Officer but not because the post is necessarily established at that grade but simply because that is the grade of the person doing the post. When he retires he may not be replaced by a Senior Officer. So that is one that I can think of at No. 6. Are they both at No. 6?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the other one is in the Treasury. So the personal-to-holder footnote does not in fact refer to the personal-to-holder scale, it refers to the fact that the post is not a post at that grade.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not established at that grade. I could have a Principal Private Secretary of any grade.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I suppose the Chief Minister could, presumably that is why he is a Senior Officer because he can have him at any grade and he chose to put him in the grade.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, in fact I think he was not of that grade when he took the job, I think he was then an SEO and he was upgraded in post.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but I do not understand that because I seem to remember that when the upgrading took place the explanation of the Chief Minister was the opposite of the one he has given now, which is to say he was upgraded because that was the level of work he was already doing in the post. So it follows that the post is at that grade.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the post is not at that grade, I remember that answer. The post is not at that grade but people who have done that job in the past have risen to that grade and I think there was an aspiration to do the same. These things are not dealt with by me.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is an unusual use of the personal-to-holder because normally personal-to-holder means the person is promoted to a grade and then even if he is doing a job which is not of that grade, he still carries the preserved right.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a job the role and responsibility and nature of which could change, he knows what it is like. The office can be restructured and it may not require a Senior Officer, and indeed it remains to be seen whether he will be replaced by a Senior Officer or not when he reaches retirement age. Anyway, theoretically any post that is not established at a particular grade, if done by somebody of that grade is on a personal-to-holder basis otherwise one is committed to replacing it with somebody of that grade upon his retirement. So I suppose it is just a way of flagging up to others that this is not such a post.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1413 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**RESIDENCE PERMITS**

Can Government confirm that they have taken a policy decision, not yet implemented, to issue five year residence permits to non-EU pensioners wishing to remain in Gibraltar on reaching retirement age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1414, 1415 and 1416 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1414 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NON-EU PENSIONERS**

Are non-EU pensioners who come to collect their pensions on a regular basis eligible for the issue of residence permits if they wish to remain in Gibraltar and register as seeking employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1413, 1415 and 1416 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1415 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NON-EU PENSIONERS**

Was the number of non-EU pensioners with residence permits 78 as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 as stated in answer to Question 565 of 2005 or 60 as stated in answer to Question 1052 of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1416 of 2005.

**NO. 1416 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NON-EU PENSIONERS**

When was the first permit issued to a non-EU pensioner to enable the person to remain in Gibraltar and register as seeking employment granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government have indeed made the in principle policy decision that legally resident non-EU nationals who reach pensionable age and who on reaching such age have resided in Gibraltar for at least 10 years within the previous 15, should continue to reside on the basis of renewable five year residence permits after they have ceased to work and without having to register as unemployed.

The Immigration Control Ordinance restricts the issue of residence permits with a validity of more than six months and not exceeding five years (the maximum period of validity) to persons who hold valid employment permits (and to the spouses and children of such persons). The Ordinance is to be amended so that Government's decision can be given effect to.

Those non-EU pensioners who have already left Gibraltar on termination of employment and, in the case of Moroccan nationals, have been issued with two year multiple visit visas to enable them to collect their pensions in person are not able to register as unemployed and take up residence again.

As I said in my answer to Question No. 565 of 2005, there was a total of 78 non-EU pensioners who were in possession of annual residence permits as at 31 March 2005. In answer to Question No. 1052 of 2005, I said that the number of unemployed non-EU pensioners on six monthly permits, which on 31 March 2005 had stood at 60 had risen to 64. Non-EU pensioners who register as unemployed and remain in Gibraltar are currently issued with six monthly residence permits. Those who continue in employment are issued with annual permits in line with their work permits.

I am told that in answer to his final question, It is not possible to identify from immigration and employment records, the first instance when a non-EU pensioner was able to register as unemployed in order to be issued with a renewable short-term residence permit and remain in Gibraltar after termination of employment. However, I can confirm to him that the arrangements came into effect gradually with the first registration taking place in 1999.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1413 TO 1416 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, in respect of Question No. 1415 the difference between the 78 and the 60 is that 18 were actually working.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly. Well actually working, not registered as unemployed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But if they have permits as being employed then presumably they had contracts of employment.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Subject only to a non-notification of a termination but yes, in principle he is right.

**NO. 1417 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT (NO. 3) PENSION SCHEME**

Have any private sector employers applied to join the Government (No. 3) Pension Scheme since it was announced and if so which employers and in respect of how many employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

To date no applications have been received to join the Government administered Provident (No. 3) Pension Scheme. It is not strictly accurate to call it a Government scheme, it is Government administered but it has its own trustees and its own trust deed. However, 31 companies have shown an interest in the scheme since it was announced.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1417 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government have any indication whether these would be companies that until now have not been providing pensions or companies that have got other arrangements and may be interested in this Government administered scheme because it might be a better option?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it is certainly cheaper, it is bound to be cheaper than any self-administered scheme or package scheme because after all the advantage of these Provident Schemes is that the administration overheads are as low as they can possibly be. I do not have the information, I would guess it is companies without a pension scheme which is who the scheme is primarily aimed at but of course it may well be that there are people interested who fall into the category that he identifies. In other words, who seek to transfer current schemes into this one.

ORAL

**NO. 1418 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Are any of the 159 employees in the Social Services Agency employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms and if so on what grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1419 to 1422 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1419 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Are any of the 233 employees in the Elderly Care Agency employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms and if so on what grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1418 and 1420 to 1422 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1420 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AND LEISURE AUTHORITY**

Are any of the 23 employees in the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms and if so on what grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1418, 1419 and 1421 to 1422 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1421 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Are any of the 149 employees in the Gibraltar Electricity Authority employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms and if so on what grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1418 to 1420 and 1422 of 2005.

**NO. 1422 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government provide the list of the officers in post in the GHA as at 30 November 2005, who were at the time contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms with the commencement dates of their contracts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1418**

There are three officers employed in the Social Services Agency on contract on temporary and non-pensionable terms. One Social Worker/Probation Officer, one part-time Social Worker/Family Court Welfare Officer and one Social Worker/Children and Families team.

**Answer to Question No. 1419**

There are 33 employees in the Elderly Care Agency employed on contract on temporary and non-pensionable terms as follows:

1	Nursing Co-ordinator
13	Staff Nurses
3	Enrolled Nurses
7	Domestics (Catering/Laundry Departments)
1	Assistant Cook
3	Administrative Officers
<u>5</u>	Maintenance
<u>33</u>	

**Answer to Question No. 1420**

None of the 23 employees at the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority are employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms.

**Answer to Question No. 1421**

None of the 149 employees in the Gibraltar Electricity Authority are employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms.

**Answer to Question No. 1422**

In relation to the GHA I hand the hon Member a schedule setting out the information requested except the names of the individuals concerned. This is the answer in which there are people that will shortly be considered for inclusion in the Provident Scheme.



**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1422/2005**

**ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT GRADES 30-09-05**

<b><u>GRADE</u></b>	<b><u>Date of Entry</u></b>
CHIEF EXECUTIVE	19-Oct-04
DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES	01-Dec-04
GHA CLERK	20-Sep-04
GHA CLERK	03-Dec-01
GHA CLERK	13-Sep-04
GHA CLERK	01-Aug-05
GHA CLERK	08-Aug-05
GHA CLERK	22-Oct-03
GHA CLERK	29-Aug-05
GHA CLERK	15-Dec-03
GHA CLERK	18-Jul-05
GHA CLERK	11-Jul-05
GHA CLERK	27-Jun-05
GHA CLERK	20-Jun-05
GHA CLERK	23-Sep-02
GHA CLERK	18-Jun-02
GHA CLERK	03-Mar-03
IT ASSISTANT	17-Jan-05
PATIENT COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR	22-Nov-04
TYPIST	13-Sep-05
TYPIST	09-Jun-05
TYPIST (pt)	09-Jun-05
RECEPTIONIST	07-Feb-05
RECEPTIONIST	01-Mar-05
RECEPTIONIST	09-Feb-05
RECEPTIONIST (pt)	09-Feb-05
RECEPTIONIST (pt)	30-Aug-05
RECEPTIONIST (pt)	07-Feb-05
RECEPTIONIST (pt)	07-Feb-05
WARD CLERK	10-Feb-03
WARD CLERK	06-Jan-03
WARD CLERK	01-Sep-03
WARD CLERK	06-Jan-03
WARD CLERK (Mat)	18-Jul-05
CATERING DIRECTOR	20-Jan-05

Cont.....

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1422/2005**

**INDUSTRIAL GRADES 30-09-05**

STORES ASSISTANT	09-Jun-03
COOK (SZ-3)	29-Mar-05

**MEDICAL & PAM GRADES 30-09-05**

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH	02-Feb-98
CONSULTANT PSYCHIATRIST	19-Apr-04
CONSULTANT PATHOLOGIST	01-Mar-01
CONSULTANT GYNAECOLOGIST	02-Jul-01
CONSULTANT PAEDIATRICIAN	05-Sep-05
CONSULTANT GENERAL SURGEON	10-May-05
CONSULTANT OPHTHALMOLOGIST	08-Jun-95
CONSULTANT PAEDIATRICIAN	01-Feb-03
CONSULTANT GERIATRICIAN	01-Feb-05
CONSULTANT ANAESTHETIST	01-Apr-05
CONSULTANT ANAESTHETIST	27-May-03
CONSULTANT ANAESTHETIST	04-Jan-05
CONSULTANT GYNAECOLOGIST	02-Feb-04
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST	01-Feb-05
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	06-Aug-03
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	18-Feb-05
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	21-Mar-01
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	05-Feb-03
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	02-Mar-05
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	06-Aug-03
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	05-Feb-01
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	05-Feb-03
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	13-Aug-04
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	28-Jan-02
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	28-Mar-05
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	27-Sep-04
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	04-Feb-04
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	04-Aug-04
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	05-Feb-97
SENIOR HOUSE OFFICER	25-Feb-97
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	01-Jul-03
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	09-Jun-03
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	26-Jan-04
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	04-Mar-02
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	19-May-03
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	23-Apr-03
GENERAL PRACTITIONER	01-Dec-88
PHYSIOTHERAPIST SENIOR II	01-Sep-04
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST SENIOR I	11-Oct-04

Cont.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST SENIOR I	07-Feb-05
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST SENIOR II	11-Oct-04
MLSO	01-Sep-03
MLSO	18-Apr-05
MLSO	03-May-05
JMLSO A	28-Feb-05
JMLSO A	01-Aug-05
RADIOGRAPHER/MAMMOGRAPHER SENIOR I	09-May-05
RADIOGRAPHER/SONOGRAPHER SENIOR I	17-May-05
RADIOGRAPHER SENIOR II	06-Jun-05
RADIOGRAPHER SENIOR II	01-Apr-05
RADIOGRAPHER HELPER	20-Jun-05
SPEECH & LANGUAGE THERAPIST	16-Feb-05
ORTHOPTIST SENIOR 1	01-Aug-05

**NURSING GRADES 30-09-05**

DIRECTOR OF NURSING & PATIENT SERVICES	01-Dec-04
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	01-Mar-99
NURSE LECTURER	04-Jul-05
NURSE PRACTITIONER	01-Feb-05
NURSE PRACTITIONER	13-Dec-04
CHARGE NURSE	09-May-04
CHARGE NURSE	10-Feb-02
STAFF NURSE	14-Jul-02
STAFF NURSE	13-Jan-02
STAFF NURSE	16-Mar-03
STAFF NURSE	08-May-05
STAFF NURSE	06-Oct-02
STAFF NURSE	29-May-05
STAFF NURSE	12-Jun-05
STAFF NURSE	12-Jun-05
STAFF NURSE	15-Oct-00
STAFF NURSE	14-Jul-02
STAFF NURSE	30-Apr-00
STAFF NURSE	23-May-04
STAFF NURSE	03-Jul-05
STAFF NURSE	12-Jun-05
STAFF NURSE	03-Jul-05
STAFF NURSE	15-May-05
STAFF NURSE	15-May-05
STAFF NURSE	01-Sep-04

Cont...

CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1422/2005

STAFF NURSE	20-Jan-02
STAFF NURSE	16-Mar-03
STAFF NURSE	13-Jan-02
STAFF NURSE	10-Sep-00
STAFF NURSE	01-May-05
STAFF NURSE (R.M.N.)	26-Nov-00
STAFF NURSE (R.M.N.)	22-May-05
STAFF NURSE (R.M.N.)	09-May-04
STAFF NURSE (R.M.N.)	26-Apr-04
STAFF NURSE (R.S.C.N.)	14-Nov-04
STAFF NURSE (R.S.C.N.)	17-Oct-04
STAFF NURSE (R.S.C.N.)	28-Nov-04
STAFF NURSE (R.S.C.N.)	01-Jun-03
STAFF NURSE (THEATRE NURSE)	18-May-03
STAFF NURSE (THEATRE NURSE)	15-Jul-01
STAFF NURSE P/T	14-Aug-05
STAFF MIDWIFE	02-Aug-04
STAFF MIDWIFE	01-Jun-04
STAFF MIDWIFE	28-Mar-99
STAFF MIDWIFE	20-Jun-04
STAFF MIDWIFE	24-Jul-05
STAFF MIDWIFE	19-Jan-03
STAFF MIDWIFE P/T	06-Apr-05
STAFF MIDWIFE P/T	28-Mar-99
ODP	05-Dec-04
ODP	12-Jun-05
ODP	26-Jun-05
ODP	23-Aug-04
ODP	06-Jun-05
ODP	31-Oct-04
ENROLLED NURSE	08-Aug-04
ENROLLED NURSE	25-Jan-04

**CONTD ANSWER TO QUESTION 1422 OF 2005**

**Answer to Question No. 1420**

None of the 23 employees at the Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority are employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms.

**Answer to Question No. 1421**

None of the 149 employees in the Gibraltar Electricity Authority are employed as contract officers on temporary and non-pensionable terms.

**Answer to Question No. 1422**

In relation to the GHA I hand the hon Member a schedule setting out the information requested except the names of the individuals concerned.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1418 TO 1422 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a particular reason why on this occasion the Government have chosen to leave the names out?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I know that in the past we have done but only that on reconsideration it is thought not to be appropriate to hand over the situation of individuals identifiable and I did not think that it would be of any interest to the hon Member. What he wants to know is the systematics position not the names of the persons involved.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the Chief Minister may remember that in the last House we were trying to find out what had happened to the people on the previous list and the answer was that it was all in boxes in the basement, so the next option was to ask who is there now so that we can compare one list of names with the other and see who is still left and who has gone.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let see if we can find a way of using perhaps numbers or something because he just wants to know when people have fallen out of the system or entered it.

ORAL

**NO. 1423 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND - EXPENDITURE**

Can Government provide the total estimated Consolidated Fund expenditure for the current financial year to 30 September 2005 giving a breakdown by Head of expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1424 to 1438 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1424 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND - REVENUE**

Can Government provide the total estimated Consolidated Fund revenue for the current financial year to 30 September 2005 giving a breakdown by Head of revenue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 and 1425 to 1438 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1425 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**I & D FUND - EXPENDITURE**

Can Government provide the total estimated Improvement and Development Fund expenditure for the current financial year to 30 September 2005 giving a breakdown by Head of expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423, 1424 and 1426 to 1438 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1426 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**I & D FUND - REVENUE**

Can Government provide the total estimated Improvement and Development Fund revenue for the current financial year to 30 September 2005 giving a breakdown by Head of revenue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1425 and 1427 to 1438 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1427 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC - REVENUE**

Can Government provide the estimated total Gibraltar Development Corporation revenue for the current financial year to 30 September 2005 giving a breakdown as follows:

- (a) Training Levy;
- (b) ESF;
- (c) Consolidated Fund Head 1B;
- (d) Miscellaneous;
- (e) Other Receipts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1426 and 1428 to 1438 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1428 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC - EXPENDITURE**

Can Government provide the total estimated Gibraltar Development Corporation expenditure for the current financial year to 30 September 2005 giving a breakdown as between Employment and Training and other divisions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1427 and 1429 to 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1429 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state what has been the operating expenditure of the Gibraltar Electricity Authority for the current financial year to 30 September giving a breakdown of personal emoluments, employment costs and other recurrent expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1428 and 1430 to 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1430 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state what has been the operating revenue of the Gibraltar Electricity Authority for the current financial year to 30 September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1429 and 1431 to 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1431 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AND LEISURE AUTHORITY**

Can Government state what have been the receipts of the Sports and Leisure Authority for the current financial year to 30 September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1430 and 1432 to 1438 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1432 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AND LEISURE AUTHORITY**

Can Government state what has been the recurrent expenditure of the Sports and Leisure Authority for the current financial year to 30 September giving a breakdown of personal emoluments and other recurrent expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1431 and 1433 to 1438 of 2005.



ORAL

**NO. 1433 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state what have been the receipts of the Social Services Agency for the current financial year to 30 September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1432 and 1434 to 1438 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1434 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state what have been the payments made by the Social Services Agency for the current financial year to 30 September with a breakdown for personal emoluments, industrial wages, other personnel and employer contributions and other recurrent expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1433 and 1435 to 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1435 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government state what have been the payments made by the Elderly Care Agency for the current financial year to 30 September giving a breakdown for personal emoluments, industrial wages, other personnel and employer contributions and other recurrent expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1434 and 1436 to 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1436 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government state what have been the receipts of the Elderly Care Agency for the current financial year to 30 September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1435, 1437 and 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1437 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA - RECEIPTS**

Can Government state what have been the receipts of the Gibraltar Health Authority for the current financial year to 30 September with a breakdown by Social Assistance Fund, GPMS, consolidated fund and other receipts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1423 to 1436 and 1438 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1438 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA - PAYMENTS**

Can Government state what have been the payments made by the Gibraltar Health Authority for the current financial year to 30 September with breakdown by personal emoluments, industrial wages, other personnel and other recurrent expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member statements giving the information that he has requested based on Treasury records as they currently stand. However, figures do not include Treasury adjustments, for example, contributions from the Consolidated Fund and Social Assistance Fund to the Agencies, Authorities and Corporation, which are normally effected by the Treasury at the end of the financial year.

**Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1423/2005**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND EXPENDITURE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

<b><u>HEAD</u></b>	<b><u>EXPENDITURE</u></b>
1A Education	£9,823,121.46
1B Employment	£245,245.91
1C Training	£257,693.26
2A Heritage and Culture	£584,307.31
2B Youth and Sport	£308,842.27
2C Broadcasting	£700,000.00
3A Housing - Administration	£1,293,873.96
3B Housing - Buildings and Works	£3,160,994.71
4A Environment	£5,124,344.75
4B Technical Services	£2,607,895.65
4C Transport - Roads and Traffic	£576,867.75
4D Utilities	£4,189,519.39
5A Social and Civic Affairs	£2,572,917.58
5B Prison	£521,583.25
6A Trade, Industry and Communications	£694,598.25
6B Tourism	£1,416,961.11
6C Port	£1,162,248.80
6D Department of Shipping	£270,430.67
6E Airport	£564,346.49
6F Postal Services	£1,225,212.24
7A Health and Civil Contingency	£9,864.28
7B Fire Service	£1,594,930.32
7C Police	£4,482,397.47
8A No. 8 Convent Place	£3,402,151.39
8B Human Resources	£297,788.32
8C Civil Status and Registration Office	£246,337.82
8D Financial and Development Secretary	£92,187.90
8E Treasury	£2,422,636.28
8F Customs	£1,902,305.65
8G Income Tax	£625,156.87
8H Finance Centre	£486,920.39
9A Law Officers	£282,521.76
9B Supreme Court	£295,940.84
9C Magistrates and Coroners Court	£178,703.50
10 House of Assembly	£470,361.45
11 Audit Office	£222,018.89
12 Supplementary Provision	£0.00
13 Contributions from Consolidated Fund - Reserve	£434,027.71
	<u>£54,747,255.65</u>

I .

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Contd Answer to Question 1423/2005**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND CHARGES**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

<b><u>HEAD</u></b>	<b><u>EXPENDITURE</u></b>
01 Statutory Offices	£316,705.62
02 Judicature	£502,223.35
03 Pensions	£9,691,367.36
04 Employer's Contributions	£1,376,650.67
05 Public Debt Charges	£5,557,997.63
06 Public Services Ombudsman	£79,798.25
07 Revenue Repayment	£5,791.50
08 Public Debt Repayment	£1,076,460.00
	<b><u>£18,606,994.38</u></b>



**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1424/2005**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND REVENUE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

<b><u>HEAD</u></b>	<b><u>REVENUE</u></b>
1     Income Taxes	£47,307,957.55
2     Duties, Taxes and Other Receipts	£17,732,305.51
3     Gambling Fees	£2,997,118.72
4     Rates and Rents	£7,160,191.89
5     Departmental Fees and Receipts	£7,172,827.83
6     Government Earnings	<u>£1,838,386.58</u>
	<u>£84,208,788.08</u>

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1425/2005**

**IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT FUND EXPENDITURE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

<b><u>HEAD</u></b>	<b><u>EXPENDITURE</u></b>
101 Housing, Health and Social Affairs	£1,201,255.79
102 Education, Sports, Leisure, Youth, Culture and Heritage	£1,650,078.22
103 Environment, Roads and Utilities	£304,061.47
104 Economic Development, Tourism, Port and Airport	£1,419,815.70
105 Public Administration and Essential Services	£363,749.84
	<u>£4,938,961.02</u>

contd...

4

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1426/2005**

**IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT FUND REVENUE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

<b><u>HEAD</u></b>		<b><u>REVENUE</u></b>
101	Contributions and Loans	£0.00
102	Sale of Government Properties	£4,150,346.99
103	Grants	£629,480.07
104	Reimbursements	£100,535.95
		<u>£4,880,363.01</u>

contd...

Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005

Answer to Question 1427/2005

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION REVENUE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Revenue**

Training Levy	£1,191,091.69
Contribution by European Social Fund ESF (I)	£1,364,805.00
Contribution from Consolidated Fund - Head 1B	£0.00
Miscellaneous	£50,495.00
	<u>£2,606,391.69</u>

**OTHER DIVISIONS**

**Revenue**

Other Receipts	<u>£1,689,566.27</u>
----------------	----------------------

Answer to Question 1428/2005

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION EXPENDITURE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Expenditure**

Employment	£287,222.33
Training	£1,014,063.60
	<u>£1,301,285.93</u>

**OTHER DIVISIONS**

**Expenditure**

Other Divisions	<u>£1,689,566.27</u>
-----------------	----------------------

contd...

6

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1429/2005**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY – OPERATING EXPENDITURE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**EXPENDITURE**

Personal Emoluments	£2,657,138.90
Employer's Contribution	£131,437.66
Other Recurrent Expenditure	<u>£7,124,615.07</u>
	<u>£9,913,191.63</u>

**Answer to Question 1430/2005**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY – OPERATING REVENUE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**REVENUE**

£6,869,545.22

**contd...**

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

Answer to Question 1431/2005

**SPORTS AND LEISURE AUTHORITY – RECEIPTS**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**RECEIPTS**

NIL

Answer to Question 1432/2005

**SPORTS AND LEISURE AUTHORITY – EXPENDITURE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**EXPENDITURE**

Personal Emoluments

£245,830.41

Other Recurrent Expenditure

£81,272.97

£327,103.38

contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1433/2005**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY – RECEIPTS**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**RECEIPTS**

**NIL**

**Answer to Question 1434/2005**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY – EXPENDITURE**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**EXPENDITURE**

Personal Emoluments	£1,169,689.41
Industrial Wages	£194,244.63
Other Personnel	£179,074.81
Employer's Contribution	£162,148.24
Other Recurrent Expenditure	£197,840.45
	<b><u>£1,902,997.54</u></b>

**contd...**

**Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 1435/2005**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY – PAYMENTS**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**PAYMENTS**

Personal Emoluments	£1,648,207.60
Industrial Wages	£417,848.56
Other Personnel	£8,688.86
Employer's Contribution	£213,776.34
Other Recurrent Expenditure	£489,999.74
	<u>£2,778,521.10</u>

**Answer to Question 1436/2005**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY – RECEIPTS**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**RECEIPTS**

£271,730.53

**contd...**



Contd Answer to Question 1438 of 2005

Answer to Question 1437/2005

**GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY – RECEIPTS**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**RECEIPTS**

Social Assistance Fund	£0.00
GPMS	£11,584,776.78
Consolidated Fund	£0.00
Other Receipts	£361,267.01
	<u>£11,946,043.79</u>

Answer to Question 1438/2005

**GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY – PAYMENTS**

**1 APRIL 2005 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2005 – TENTATIVE FIGURES AS AT  
3 DECEMBER 2005**

**PAYMENTS**

Personal Emoluments	£9,735,979.90
Industrial Wages	£1,022,793.89
Other Personnel	£1,704,931.40
Other Recurrent Expenditure	£11,847,625.60
	<u>£24,311,330.79</u>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1423 TO 1438 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I notice that there is a sum of £1,076,000 in respect of public debt repayment. I am sure the Chief Minister will remember that we had an exchange in the last meeting of the House as to whether the repayment of the maturing debt, which was then refinanced by issuing new debt, was something that would appear in the Consolidated Fund charges in the course of this year. So can he say what this particular repayment is in respect of?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot tell him that, I have not analysed this information and he asks for half yearly financial information and I give it to him but I am not in a position to analyse it with him. I have got an answer to the exchange we had at the last Question Time which is that as he knows, under the Constitution all repayments are paid out of the Consolidated Fund and all proceeds of borrowing can go either to the Consolidated Fund or to the Improvement and Development Fund. The answer is that they are netted in Consolidated Fund only and therefore the new debt goes into the Improvement and Development Fund and the whole of the repayment is shown in the Consolidated Fund. In other words, the figure appearing here, I think this is where the discussion began in relation to Head 8 Public Debt Repayments, the £8,000 figure, that figure is net. In other words, to answer his original specific query if in the Consolidated Fund money is paid out in repayment of debt but money is also paid in being the proceeds of new debt, paid into the Consolidated Fund being the proceeds of new debt then the figure that would appear here is the net figure representing the net outflow. So it is not the whole amount on the basis that legally the whole amount has had to come out of the Consolidated Fund, that is what I am told by the Treasury.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So that might be the explanation for the £1 million. In effect it means that up to September there was a net outflow of £1 million which of course might be reversed by the end of the year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, exactly. Particularly given the use of revolving bank facilities. But then of course it is shown both in and out of the Estimates book.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the receipts of the different Authorities and Agencies, the new figure is because it is technically being done with advances from the Consolidated Fund and then the figure is finalised when the final figures are available?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly so. Remember that the Government do not account on a six monthly or quarterly basis, they close their books at the end of the year and everything else is advance accounts and one clearing account.

**NO. 1439 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government confirm whether or not the £10 million company tax collected in March 2005 in respect of company tax included an amount in respect of the tax liabilities for tax years up to 2003/2004 and if so state what was the amount of the tax paid in respect of such liabilities giving the breakdown by the respective relevant tax years up to 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of £10.7 million was collected in Corporation Tax in March 2005 and not £10 million as stated in the Question formulated by the hon Member. The breakdown is as follows:

Year of Assessment	Amount £,000
2001/2002 and earlier	31
2002/2003	249
2003/2004	400
2004/2005	10,020
	<u>£10,700</u>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1439 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, contrary to the impression that was given in earlier answers, the bulk of the money is in respect of the tax year ending in June 2005, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. Is this not an issue that we discussed last time too about whether it included or did not include a settlement?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We did discuss it the last time but I do not think it was left frankly at a position where the explanation was a clear one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is what I am told is the position in relation to the composition of that amount. I asked the Commissioner to analyse the figure of collections in March 2005 and he says two separate questions arise, (a) why was such a high amount, that is £10.7 million collected in March 2005?; and (b) why was the take for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 £10.8 million higher than estimated? That is, £27.8 million collected against an estimate of £17 million. Dealing first then with the question of the extent for March 2005 collection, apparently for some years now the Corporation Tax collected in March of each financial year has been rather high compared to that collected in other months. The March receipts for each of the last three financial years as a percentage of the total collected throughout the whole year, have been 38.4 per cent in March 2005, 39.2 per cent in March 2004 and 30 per cent in March 2003, as a percentage of the whole year's yield collection. Apparently this can be taken as a measure of the department's success in promptly assessing and collecting corporation tax, or at least the improvement in it. Apparently it is an indication that the department is fairly up to date in this area of assessment and collection. Many companies are now assessed for the current year of assessment in the current financial year, hence assessments are payable on 31<sup>st</sup> March and not within two months from the date of issue of the assessment as in the case for years other than the current year. So in other words, because they are assessing more quickly and these things are paid, are due by 31<sup>st</sup> March under the new provisions in the Ordinance, they are being paid within the financial year because companies are assessed on a preceding year basis. Another contributing factor was the Commissioner of Income Tax's decision to reduce the period of time allowed to companies whose accounting year end is other than 30<sup>th</sup> June to lodge their accounts with the Income Tax Office. This resulted in a number of big players being assessed for two years of assessment in one financial year, that is, 2004/2005 this obviously had an impact on 2005, March 2005 takings.

Now we also discussed, the hon Member will recall, whether the settlement of a particular corporation was included or not. The Commissioner can confirm that that particular settlement did not affect the March 2005 collection but did contribute to the increased take for the year, as the company paid £2.6 million in December 2004. So it affected the yield for the whole year up to March 2005 but did not contribute to the £10.7 million collected in March itself, and we are still hoping to collect about £20 million this year. I think that answers the questions that were left in the air last time. I think I may have inadvertently misled him last time by suggesting that the settlement was part of the explanation for the high March take and the answer is that it is not, it contributes to the year's take but not to the March take.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So that in fact March is not strictly speaking a one off high?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It has been so for the last three years for the reasons that the Commissioner has explained in his briefing note. Indeed, we are expecting the same thing to happen this year.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1440 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Based on the 2004/2005 Employers Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted to 30 November 2005 what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and number of employees as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government owned/Joint Venture Companies;
- (d) Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1440 of 2005**

Based on the 2004/2005 Employers' Annual Statement, declaration and Certificate submitted up to 5 December 2005 the information sought is as follows:

	£M	Approximate No of Employee/Deduction Cards
(a) MOD	5.0	2,650
(b) Gibraltar Government	23.2	6,500
(c) Government owned and Joint Venture Companies	3.1	600
(d) Private Sector Employment	<u>37.0</u>	<u>17,700</u>
	68.3 =====	27,450 =====



ORAL

**NO. 1441 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of company tax collected in each month since August 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1442 and 1443 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1442 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since August 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1441 and 1443 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1443 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of November 2005 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/96 to 2004/05 had been assessed for Company Tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information.

**Answer to Question 1443****Answer to Question No 1441 of 2005**

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in months of September 2005 and October 2005 is:

	£M
September 2005	0.2
October 2005	0.3

**Answer to Question No 1442 of 2005**

The PAYE tax (net of refunds) collected in the months of September 2005 and October 2005 is detailed hereunder:

	£M
September 2005	5.5
October 2005	6.7

**Answer to Question 1443 of 2005**

	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Assessed	15.8	15.6	19.8	25.8	89.0	27.6	30.8	35.7	35.0	29.3
Discharged	<u>5.8</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>75.2</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>15.9</u>	<u>19.0</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>7.4</u>
	10.0	10.5	10.6	14.7	13.8	13.4	14.9	16.7	22.8	21.9
Paid	<u>9.5</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>14.4</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>14.1</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>21.0</u>	<u>18.3</u>
Outstanding	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>
=====										
No of Companies	1446	1418	1467	1459	1544	1578	1529	1496	1461	1306

ORAL

**NO. 1444 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS - RATES**

Can Government confirm whether the estimated receipts of £ 12.7 million in respect of rates reflects the reduction in payments by MOD as a result of property transfers to the Government and if so can it further state what that reduction has amounted to in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1445 of 2005.

**NO. 1445 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS – GAMING TAX**

Can Government confirm whether the estimated receipts of gaming tax of £4.8 million in the current financial year takes into account the increase in the level at which such payments are capped, recently legislated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The answer to his first question is yes.

The estimated rates receipts of £12.7 million for 2005/2006 included the UK Government's Contribution-in-lieu-of-Rates (CILOR) of £2,057,573. This was an increase over the previous year when £1,966,423 of CILOR was paid.

There are various adjustments made each year to the Net Annual Value of HMG's estate in Gibraltar, which includes increases in respect of additional and refurbished properties and decreases for properties to be transferred to the Government. For the 2005/2006 CILOR premises due to be transferred in the previous year, but that had not taken place, were added back into the computation.

**Answer to Question No. 1445**

Gaming Tax Cap increases however are not included in the estimate of £4.8 million.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1446 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CURRENCY NOTE INCOME ACCOUNT**

Can Government explain what has produced the reduction in the management expenses of the currency note income account from £86,000 in 2003/2004 to an estimated £66,000 for the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1447 to 1449 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1447 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CURRENCY NOTE INCOME ACCOUNT**

Can Government explain the increase in the interest earned on investments by the currency note income account from an estimated £280,000 to a forecast outturn of £424,000 in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1446, 1448 and 1449 of 2005.



**ORAL**

**NO. 1448 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND – INTEREST RECEIPTS**

Can Government explain the higher interest receipts of the Consolidated Fund forecast at £745,000 outturn as compared to £400,000 estimated originally for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1446, 1447 and 1449 of 2005.

**NO. 1449 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**REDEMPTION OF COINS - COST**

Can Government explain the cost of redemption of coins of £529,000 in 2004/2005 given that there was no such cost provided for in the estimated expenditure for that year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1446 of 2005**

The estimate for management expenses of the Currency Note Income Account is based on the proportion of time attributable to Currency Note Income Account work carried out by Treasury staff, which is reviewed annually.

The reduction reflects more efficient use of resources by the Treasury and a corresponding adjustment in the apportionment of labour costs.

**Answer to Question No. 1447 of 2005**

The original estimate of £280,000 for interest earned on investment credited to the Currency Note Income Account was based on a Note Security Fund balance of £16 million and an interest rate of 1.75 per cent (that is, 2 per cent below Base Rate).

Base rate increased in 2004/2005 on three occasions with an increase from 3.75 per cent to 4.75 per cent in August 2004. Therefore, the interest rate applicable to investments received by the Currency Note Income Account increased from 1.75 per cent to 2.75 per cent (that is, an increase of 57 per cent). However, the effect of this increase was spread throughout the year and the actual increase in the forecast estimate was 51 per cent, that is, an increase in interest earned from £280,000 to £424,000.

**Answer to Question No. 1448 of 2005**

Interest credited to the Consolidated Fund reflects the general level of interest rates which have increased by 1 per cent during the year, and also reflects the average level of cash held by the Consolidated Fund which in itself is dependent on the timing of cash inflows and cash outflows. That explains the higher interest there.

**Answer to Question No. 1449 of 2005**

No cost of redemption of coins was provided for in the estimates for the financial year 2004/2005 because it was not possible at the time of preparation of those estimates to establish the level of sterling as opposed to local coins which had been returned by the Banks. This was due to a backlog in the Post Office of unsegregated coins returned by the Banks.

The Treasury took over responsibility for this from the Post Office in April 2004. Coins to a value of £602,000 were segregated, in other words Gibraltar coins separated from UK coins, during the course of the financial year, of which £529,000 were local coins returned to stock. The hon Member will see that there is an estimate again in this year where we hope to segregate the remaining amount. So basically coins were just being taken in and not dealt with as redemptions because they were mixed up with UK and Gib coins so no one knew how much was retrievable by sending off coins to the UK et cetera. That situation has now been taken a grip of by the Treasury and that is the cost in one year and there is a substantial cost again this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1446 TO 1449 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Why should it cost us to send coins back to the UK?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it does not cost us to send coins to the UK, that is money that we receive because when we send coins to the UK we collect notes or the value equivalent. What costs us is establishing the local coins because then that is a redemption. Arguably the redemption took place before but as everything was mixed in a bag no one knew how much was redemption and how much was actually an asset. In other words, a coin that we could redeem in the UK. So that is the situation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have heard the explanation it is just that it does not make a lot of sense. Are we saying that when we did not look in the bag we did not have to pay anything and now that we have started looking in the bag it is costing £500,000 a year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not costing £500,000 a year, it is costing £500,000 this year and last year because of a year's worth of unsegregated coins. Now, what are unsegregated coins? That is coins which Banks usually have returned to the Government. Well not the Government, the Treasury on behalf of the Coinage Fund. At that point, theoretically, when the bank sends in Gibraltar coins and we give them other value, at that point theoretically I believe, we are redeeming the local ones. We do not know how many there are in there, we are paying for the lot, some of it will be recoverable from the UK when we in turn redeem whatever is subsequently

established to be UK coinage and the rest in effect we have redeemed local coinage. But because no one was doing the segregating no one knew how much was redemption and how much was not redemption of local coinage. That situation is now being put right and in two years it will be eliminated. It is not that it is continuously £500,000 per year, that is the cost of the backlog, there will be some annual cost now that the Treasury is doing this on a constant basis.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1450 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government provide the level of Government deposits in the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 30 September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1451 of 2005.

**NO. 1451 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government provide the level of non-Government deposits in the Gibraltar Savings Bank giving a breakdown of on-call accounts, debentures, bonds and ordinary accounts as at 30 September?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1450 of 2005**

Government deposits held with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 30 September 2005 is £65.21 million.

**Answer to Question No. 1451 of 2005**

Non-Government deposits held with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 30 September 2005 is £140.69 million, the breakdown being as follows:

	£'M
On-Call Investment Accounts	16.10
Debentures	97.13
Bonds	7.40
Ordinary Accounts	20.06
	<u>140.69</u>

**ORAL**

**NO. 1452 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of November 2005, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 30 November 2005 is as follows:

Monthly Income Debentures	£29,707,400
Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures	£66,170,500

ORAL

**NO. 1453 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**REVOLVING LOAN FACILITIES**

Can Government state what has been the amount of outstanding Government debt in respect of the revolving loan from local banks in October 2005 and November 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The amount of outstanding Government debt in respect of the revolving loan from local banks in October 2005 and November 2005 is as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Barclays</b>	<b>NatWest</b>	<b>Total</b>
October 2005	£10,000,000	£10,000,000	£20,000,000
November 2005	£10,000,000	£10,000,000	£20,000,000



**NO. 1454 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY – PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state how much has been collected as stamp duty on property sales in the months of October and November?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised that Government's agent, Land Property Services Limited, do not maintain analysed records of transactions in respect of stamp duty paid. The following figures are comprised of all stamp duty paid and not just that pertaining to property sales:

October 2005	£218,983.96
November 2005	£149,763.66

I would expect the vast bulk of that relates to real estate.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1454 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I assume therefore then that this also applies to the answer given to Question No. 1051 when the Chief Minister thought that the answer he had given me was all property sales, it is not the case then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think so, yes, it must be.